

# CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and L. J. TRINTERUD  
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,  
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Missionary Re-  
search Library*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,  
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-  
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Divinity School,  
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke  
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-  
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological  
Seminary*)

Vol. XXIII

December, 1954

No. 4

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DENOMINATIONALISM: THE SHAPE OF PROTESTANTISM IN AMERICA <i>Sidney E. Mead</i>	291
AMERICAN PROTESTANT JOURNALS AND THE NAZI RELIGIOUS ASSAULT <i>Frederick K. Wentz</i>	321
THE PALATINATE CHURCH ORDER OF 1563 <i>Bard Thompson</i>	339
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN CHURCH HISTORY	355
SURVEY OF RECENT LITERATURE	360
BRITISH CHURCH HISTORY .....	Winthrop S. Hudson
MEDIEVAL CHURCH HISTORY .....	Ray C. Petry

## CONTENTS

### BOOK REVIEWS:

368

- OLSON, ADOLPH: *A Centenary History as Related to the Baptist General Conference of America* ..... Richard C. Wolf
- DIX, DOM GREGORY: *Jew and Greek: A Study in the Primitive Church* ..... F. W. Beare
- BURLEIGH, JOHN S., ed.: *Augustine: Earlier Writings* ..... Roy W. Battenhouse
- SOUTHWELL, ROBERT: *An Humble Supplication to Her Maiestie* ..... Nancy Brown
- KOENKER, E. B.: *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* ..... Cyril C. Richardson
- LATOURETTE, KENNETH SCOTT: *The Christian World Mission in Our Day* ..... Theodore F. Romig
- JONES, ILION T.: *A Historical Approach to Evangelical Worship* ..... Bard Thompson
- HUGHES, PHILIP: *The Reformation in England: II Religio Depopulata* ..... E. Harris Harbison
- RAHILL, PETER J.: *The Catholic Indian Missions and Grant's Peace Policy, 1870-1884* ..... Clifford M. Drury
- STEARNS, RAYMOND PHINEAS: *The Strenuous Puritan: Hugh Peter, 1598-1660* ..... J. F. Maclear
- BRADSHAW, MARION JOHN: *Free Churches and Christian Unity* ..... Verne D. Morey
- SHUSTER, GEORGE N.: *Religion Behind the Iron Curtain* ..... Stephen A. Fischer-Galati
- NYSSA, ST. GREGORY OF: *The Lord's Prayer; The Beatitudes* ..... Edward Rochie Hardy
- SMITH, WALDO E. L.: *What Time the Tempest. An Army Chaplain's story* ..... John T. McNeill
- GALLAGHER, LOUIS J., S.J., Trans.: *China in the Sixteenth Century*: ..... Joseph M. Kitagawa
- BINKLEY, LUTHER J.: *The Mercersburg Theology and*
- ZIEGLER, HOWARD J. B.: *Frederick Augustus Rauch, American Hegelian* ..... J. H. Nichols
- STUBER, STANLEY I.: *Primer on Roman Catholicism for Protestants* ..... Ralph Douglas Hyslop
- BROWN, IRA V.: *Lyman Abbott: Christian Evolutionist*.....Winthrop S. Hudson

## DENOMINATIONALISM: THE SHAPE OF PROTESTANTISM IN AMERICA

SIDNEY E. MEAD  
*University of Chicago*

The Christianity which developed in the United States [after 1800] was unique. It displayed features which marked it as distinct from previous Christianity in any other land. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Christianity of Canada most nearly resembled it, but even that was not precisely like it.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Latourette's generalization applies primarily to the institutional forms rather than to the theology of Christianity in the United States, which latter has been surprisingly derivative—lacking in originality, uniqueness, and distinctiveness.

The basis of this institutional uniqueness has been the "free church" idea. The phrase "free churches" is used in various and confusing ways—sometimes to designate those churches of congregational polity, sometimes those peculiarly distinguished by their "liberal views. But most properly the phrase designates those churches under the system of separation of Church and State. Here the qualifying word "free" is used in the basic sense of independent and autonomous, and in the context of long tradition thus designates those churches that are independent of the State and autonomous in relation to it.

The denomination is the organizational form which the "free churches" have accepted and assumed. It was evolved in the United States under the complex and peculiar situation that there existed between the Revolution and the Civil War.

The denomination, unlike the traditional forms of the Church, is not primarily confessional, and it is certainly not territorial. Rather it is purposive. And unlike any previous "church" in Christendom, it has no official connection with a civil power whatsoever. A "church" as "church" has no legal existence in the United States, but is represented legally by a civil corporation in whose name the property is held and the necessary business transacted. Neither is the denomination a "sect" in any traditional sense, and certainly not in the most common sense of a dissenting body in relationship to an Established Church. It is, rather, a voluntary association of like-hearted and like-minded individuals, who are united on the basis of common beliefs for the purpose of accomplishing tangible and defined objectives. One of the primary objectives is the propagation of its point of view, which it in some sense holds to be "true." Hence to try to divide the many religious

bodies in the United States under the categories of "church" and "sect" is usually more confusing than helpful, especially since by long custom "church" is commonly used in a way that implies approbation, and "sect" in a way that implies derogation.

Keeping these considerations in mind, however, I have for the sake of variety followed the practice common in America when discussing the Protestant bodies, of using the words "church," "sect," and "denomination" as synonymous.

It is the purpose of this paper to delineate some elements that were woven into the denominational structure during the formative years, and to suggest how these elements have conditioned the thought, life, and work of American Protestantism down to the present.

## I

In Christendom from the fourth century to the end of the eighteenth Christianity was organized in an Established Church or Churches. The one Church reached its peak in expression and power during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. At that time it actually possessed and wielded tremendous tangible, overt power in the affairs of men, and more subtly tremendous and formative cultural power in the souls of men. The heart of this Church was creedal or confessional belief in supernatural power mediated to men through the sacraments. It claimed inclusiveness and universality as the one true Church of Christ on earth, but by the same token it was necessarily exclusive. Outside the Church and its sacraments there was no salvation, although this had to be asserted with humility because ultimately only God knew his own with certainty.

The Reformation broke up this tangible unity of the one Church in Christendom. On the one hand its claim to be, not a revolt *from* the Church but merely an attempt to reform the church within and on the true principles of the Church itself, was inherently valid. But on the other hand the true principles of the Church had become so inextricably mingled with the organizational forms and practices that honest re-formation meant revolt from the existing institution. This movement coincided with the emergence into self-consciousness of the modern nations, back of which were the complex economic, social, and political movements that ushered in and have shaped modern western civilization.

Inevitably the spiritual reformation and consequent institutional fragmentation of the Church developed affinities with the rising national consciousnesses—and found physical protective power in the new states to oppose the physical power controlled by Rome. Thus the one re-formation of the Church found diverse expressions in the na-



tions—Lutheranism within the realms of the German princes and the Scandinavian countries, Anglicanism in England, Reformed in Geneva and Scotland, and so on.

The conflict culminated in the Thirty Years War that devastated Europe. The Westphalian settlements of 1648 marked a grudging recognition of the necessity to live-and-let-live within the several territorial areas. The basis for the churches that thus emerged was both confessional and territorial. And each of these churches in its own territory and in its own way continued to make the claims traditionally made by the one true Church. Each as a Church assumed the traditional responsibilities, and each clung to the long established principle of religious uniformity enforced by the civil power within a commonwealth. These were the churches of the "right-wing."

Meanwhile in the turmoil of re-formation had emerged certain "heretical" individuals and movements that, appealing to the commonly accepted authority of Scripture, began to claim freedom of religious belief and expression as a right. These were the "sects" of the "left-wing." They were voluntary groups without status or social responsibility and power. From the viewpoint of the official churches they were schismatic as well as heretical, and hence thought to be subversive of all order and government whether civil or ecclesiastical. And so almost universally strenuous repressive measures were invoked against them.

## II

Representatives of practically all the religious groups of Europe, both "right" and "left" wing, were transplanted to that part of America that was to become the United States. There they learned in a relatively short time to live together in peace under the genial aegis of the Dutch and English combination of patriotic-religious fervor, toleration, cynicism, simple desire for profits, effacacious muddling through, and "salutary neglect" that made up the colonial policy of these nations. The eventual result was that by 1787, after independence was won, it was recognized that if there was to be a *United States* of America, then religious freedom had to be written into the new national constitution.<sup>2</sup>

It was of course recognized that this was a departure from the prevailing tradition of almost fourteen hundred years standing in Christendom. But by this time many both within and without the religious groups were in a mood to agree with Thomas Jefferson:

As to tradition, if we are Protestants we reject all tradition, and rely on the scripture alone, for that is the essence and common principle of all the protestant churches.<sup>3</sup>

Even so, the transplanted offshoots of Europe's State Churches—the "right-wing" groups—retained their position of prestige and dominance in the new land throughout the colonial period. At the close of the Revolution the four largest and most powerful religious groups were the Congregationalists, the Anglicans, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians. Of these four, the Baptist "sect" held nowhere near the position of power and respect accorded the other three. Fifth in size were the Lutherans, sixth the German Reformed, and seventh the Dutch Reformed. Meanwhile the Methodist body, still in swaddling clothes in the Anglican manger, was twelfth in size.<sup>4</sup>

To be sure the dominant, powerful and respected "right-wing" churches had experienced considerable internal change during the vicissitudes of the colonial period, and especially during the upheavals growing out of the great revivals. But there was as yet little indication and less awareness that the church patterns of America would be markedly different from those of Europe. Hence Ezra Stiles' prediction in 1783 that no doubt the future of Christianity in America would lie about equally with Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, seemed eminently plausible.

The radical change in the relative size of the religious bodies in America took place during the brief period between roughly 1787 and 1850. By the latter date the Roman Catholic church, which at the close of the Revolution was tenth in point of size and everywhere except in Pennsylvania laboring under some civil restrictions, was the largest. Second in size were the Methodists, followed by the Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Lutherans. Seventh in size were the Disciples—an upstart group less than twenty years old. The Protestant Episcopal church had fallen to eighth place, while perhaps most amazing of all, Joseph Smith's Mormons were ninth.<sup>5</sup>

Since this configuration of relative size has persisted in the United States for about a century—with a few notable exceptions such as the Congregationalists' drop from fifth to ninth place—we may speak of this period as the "formative" years for the American denominations. The story of the numerical growth and geographical expansion of the several ecclesiastical institutions, while by no means complete in every detail is sufficiently well established for the immediate purposes of this paper.

### III

Our concern is with the mind and spirit of these "free" churches—their genius which was woven from many diverse strands during this formative period and has continued largely to define their direction, life, and work down to the present.

Religious freedom and the "frontier" provided the broad ideologi-

cal and geographical setting in which these developments took place. The first meant the removal of traditional civil and ecclesiastical restrictions on vocal and organizational expressions of the religious convictions and even the whimsies of all men. The "frontier" provided the necessary space and opportunities in which such expressions could thrive. It was this combination of freedom and opportunity in all areas that made this period what Whitehead called it, the "Epic Epoch of American life"<sup>6</sup>—the period of "Freedom's Ferment" as Alice Felt Tyler most aptly dubbed it.

My general interpretation is based upon the view that what individuals and groups do when given freedom depends upon what they are (their character) when such freedom is offered. Hence an understanding of the development of what we note as characteristic traits of the denominations that took place during the formative period, hinges in large part upon a delineation of characteristic attitudes and practices that came to be accepted during the colonial period. In keeping with this suggestion I shall now take up in somewhat schematic fashion several important elements, ideas or practices, that went into the making of the denominations, and which together gave and still gives them their distinctive character.

#### A

The first to be noted is the "sectarian" tendency of each American denomination to seek to justify its peculiar interpretations and practices as more closely conforming to those of the early Church as pictured in the New Testament than the views and policies of its rivals. This tendency is closely related to a kind of historylessness exhibited, as Professor Latourette has pointed out, in the "marked tendency" of American Protestantism during the nineteenth century "to ignore the developments which had taken place in Christianity in the Old World after the first century."<sup>7</sup>

This anti-historical bias itself has long historical roots. Roman Catholicism developed the idea of the Bible as the Word of God within the context of the Church which through apostolic succession from Peter was the bearer of the tradition. The purity and authority of the Church in speaking out of the tradition, was in turn guarded by the sacraments of baptism and ordination. Thus the Church, as the continuing, tangible historical reality, always stood as interpreter of the Word to the individual, and in this sense spoke out of the tradition with authority equal to that of the Bible.

The Reformers, in revolt against the Church as it then existed, appealed over the practices of the Church to the Word as found in the Bible. But the Reformation which took shape in the "right-wing" Lutheran, Anglican, and Reformed versions, held the doctrine of the

Word together with doctrines of the Church and Ministry in such fashion as to guard against individual "enthusiasm" and to preserve the sense of the unbroken historical continuity of Christianity.

The "left-wing" sects, in their fight for existence against almost universal opposition, sought a source of unquestioned authority that would undercut all the tradition-based claims of both Roman Catholics and "right-wing" Protestants over them. They found it in the Bible, which as the commonly recognized Word of God, they proposed to place directly in the hands of the Spirit-guided individual Christian as his only necessary guide to faith and practice. The common thrust of these groups was toward "*no creed but the Bible*" and the right of "private judgment," under grace, in its interpretation.<sup>8</sup> In practice this meant appeal over the authority of all churches and historical traditions subsequently developed to the authority of the beliefs and practices of primitive Christianity as pictured in the New Testament.

In America, although the churches of the "right-wing" were everywhere dominant during the colonial period, the situation in the long run played into the hands of the "left-wing" view. For there, under the necessity to live side by side with those from other lands and different backgrounds, the angularities of the transplanted national and religious traditions tended to cancel each other out. Crèvecoeur clearly delineated this tendency, and attributed it to the fact that

zeal in Europe is confined; here it evaporates in the great distance it has to travel; there it is a grain of power inclosed, here it burns in the open air, and consumes without effect.<sup>9</sup>

Nevertheless as Christians, whether Lutheran, Anglican, Congregational, Presbyterian, Baptist, Quaker, or what not, all shared the Bible—the center and symbol of a common Christian beginning and heritage, and for all the highest authority. Hence each in defense of its peculiar way against the others, was increasingly pressed to fall back on this one commonly recognized authority and to argue that its denominational teaching and way most closely conformed to the Biblical patterns. Thus in America where, unlike their European parents, the transplanted "right-wing" churches never possessed or were soon shorn of effective coercive power to suppress dissent and enforce uniformity, their leaders were almost forced to enter the argument if at all pretty much on the terms originally set by the "left-wing" groups.

Meanwhile the common sense of opportunity to begin all over again in the new land, which was so characteristic a feature of the mind of the early planters, also worked to erase the sense of continuity with the historic Church and to accentuate appeal to the teachings of Jesus and the practices of primitive Christianity. For even to nominal or cultural Christians of the 17th century, this opportunity was bound

to be interpreted as an occasion ordained by God to begin again at the point where mankind had first gone astray—at Eden, the paradise of man before the fall. Here is deeply rooted the commonly observed and usually irritating assumption of innocence on the part of many Americans.

But to ardent churchmen and Biblicists the opportunity was bound to be seen as a providential chance to begin over again at a selected point in history where it was thought the Christian Church had gone astray. John Cotton was not unusual in speaking of the churches formed by the Puritans in New England as exceptionally close to what would be set up "if the Lord Jesus were here himself in person."<sup>10</sup>

Both the Pietistic and Rationalistic movements of the eighteenth century, each in its own way, worked to the same general end. The personal religious experience emphasized by the Pietists was assumed to be a duplication of the experience of New Testament Christians. And rationalistic social and political leaders and reformers, in their battle against existing ecclesiastical institutions, soon learned to appeal to the pure moral teachings of Jesus (whom they saw as the first great Deist) as the norm by which these could be judged and found wanton. In essence the views of Pietists and Rationalists were so close together that both could agree with the Unitarian Joseph Priestley that the story of the Christian Church was largely a sordid history of the "corruptions" of pure Christianity through the inventions and contrivances of clever men. Thus both reached the same conclusion, namely that the forms, practices and traditions of the historic church were neither binding nor of particular interest to the present.

Hence, in summary, in the constellation of ideas prevailing during the Revolutionary epoch in which the denominations began to take shape were: the idea of pure and hence normative beginnings to which return was possible; the idea that the intervening history was largely that of aberrations and corruptions which was better ignored; and the idea of the opportunity to begin building anew in the new land on the true and ancient foundations. It is notable that the most successful of the definitely Christian indigenous denominations in America, the Disciples of Christ, grew out of the idea of a "new reformation" to be based, not on new insights, but on a "restoration" of the practices of the New Testament church—on which platform, it was thought, all the diverse groups of modern Christendom could unite insofar as they could shed the accumulated corruptions of the Church through the centuries. Typically American, this beginning over again was not conceived as a new beginning, but as a picking up of the lost threads of primitive Christianity.<sup>11</sup>

But the common view of the normative nature of the pure moral

teachings of Jesus or New Testament religious experience and organizational forms, which undercut appeal to all intervening traditions, actually provided few restrictions on the ardent men and women who were busily engaged in building new churches in the new land.

For the actual content of the Rationalists' pure religion and morals of Jesus, although Jefferson happily thought it was "as easily distinguished" from other matters in the Gospels "as diamonds in a dunghill,"<sup>12</sup> turned out to be surprisingly like current Deistic Views. The Pietist as easily found his kind of emphasis on religious experience indigenous in the New Testament. And both found their version of "the church" to be identical with the Church of the Bible. Hence those in both camps were free to move with the tides of history, pragmatically, experimentally—incorporating as much of the traditional and the new in their structures as to each seemed valid and desirable. Here is part of the explanation of the often puzzling combination of Biblical authoritarianism with experimental and pragmatic activism in American religious life.<sup>13</sup>

Men of some historical learning and consciousness, like the doughty John W. Nevin of the German Reformed Church's Mercersburg Seminary, protested that the "sectarian" appeal to

private judgment and the Bible involves, of necessity, a protest against the authority of all previous history, except so far as it may seem to agree with what is thus found to be true; in which case, of course, the only real measure of truth is taken to be, not this authority of history at all, but the mind, simply, of the particular sect itself. . . . A genuine sect will not suffer itself to be embarrassed for a moment, either at its start or afterwards, by the consideration that it has no proper root in past history. Its ambition is rather to appear in this respect autochthonic, aboriginal, self sprung from the Bible, or through the Bible from the skies.<sup>14</sup>

But by 1849 when this was published, such were passing voices crying in the lush wilderness of the American free church, sectarian system that had no mind to be bound by the past, and little thought that wisdom might be found even by American churchmen between the first and the nineteenth centuries.

Thus in spite of almost universal appeal to the authority of the Bible, and a tendency to literalistic interpretation of it, the architects of the American denominations appear to have been surprisingly unbound by the past, by tradition. But it must be added that their freedom in this respect was largely the appearance or feeling of freedom possible only to those ignorant of their rich history. Hence in a sense the very freedom which they felt and acted upon, a freedom without historical perspective, served many times to bind them to the tendencies of the moment that appeared to be obvious. Hence in all innocence they built into the life of the denominations what time and tide<sup>14</sup> happened



to bring to their shores. And each tended to sanctify indiscriminately all the various elements of doctrine and practice that it for whatever reason adopted, under the supposition that it but followed a blueprint revealed in the Word of God.

## B

The second element to be noted is the voluntary principle. Voluntaryism is the necessary corollary of religious freedom which, resting on the principle of free, uncoerced consent made the several religious groups voluntary associations, equal before but independent of the civil power and of each other. What the churches actually gave up with religious freedom was coercive power—the revolution in Christian thinking which they accepted was dependence upon persuasion alone.

The religious groups were somewhat prepared to accept such dependence by their experiences during the great colonial revivals that swept the country from the 1720's to the Revolution. The revivals in every area led to a head-on clash between the defenders of the forms and practices of "right-wing" Protestantism and the revivalists, and in every case the revivalists triumphed, insofar as the acceptance of revivalism, however reluctantly, was concerned. Meanwhile the revivals had demonstrated the possibilities of and had taught confidence in dependence upon persuasion alone. Once this battle was won in the churches, the principle of voluntaryism became a leaven in the mind and practices of the religious groups, conditioning their development.

Conceiving the church as a voluntary association tends to push tangible, practical considerations to the fore, by placing primary emphasis on the free uncoerced consent of the individual. Thus a recent history of Congregationalism published by that denomination's press, declares that

a Congregational church is a group of Christians associated together for a definite purpose, not because of peculiarities of belief

and the members of local churches

are not asked to renounce their previous denominational teachings but are asked to join in a simple covenant pledging cooperation and fellowship.<sup>16</sup>

Hence the center of a denomination, as of any other voluntary association, is a tangible, defined objective to which consent can be given. During the actual struggles for religious freedom, the common objective was recognition of the right to worship God in public as each saw fit and without civil restraints or disabilities. Once this was achieved, each group was free to define its own peculiar objectives.

In relation to the voluntary principle Christianity itself tends to be conceived primarily as an activity, a movement, which the group is



engaged in promoting. If the group *has* a confessional basis, its attitude toward it is likely to become promotional and propagandistic, as for example, witness Missouri Synod Lutheranism. Anything that seems to stand in the way of or to hinder the effectiveness of such promotion is likely to be considered divisive and a threat to the internal unity and general effectiveness of the group. For example, insofar as theology is an attempt to define and clarify intellectual positions it is apt to lead to discussion, differences of opinion, even to controversy, and hence to be divisive. And this has had a strong tendency to dampen serious discussion of theological issues in most groups, and hence to strengthen the general anti-intellectual bias inherent in much of revivalistic Pietism. This in turn helps to account for the surprising lack of interdenominational theological discussion, or even consciousness of theological distinctiveness among the many groups. "Fundamentalism" in America, among other things, was a movement that tried to recall these denominations to theological and confessional self-consciousness. But it was defeated in every major denomination, not so much by theological discussion and debate as by effective political manipulations directed by denominational leaders to the sterilizing of this "divisive" element.

Voluntaryism further means that a powerful selective factor is at work in the choice of denominational leaders, since such leaders finally gain and hold support and power in the group through persuasion and popular appeal to the constituency. This means that whatever else top denominational leaders *may be*, they *must be* denominational politicians. Tocqueville was surprised to find that everywhere in America "you meet with a politician where you expected to find a priest."<sup>16</sup> Similar factors are of course at work in the American Republic at large and all the factors that Lord Bryce pointed out as militating against the great man's chances of becoming President of the United States operate in the same fashion in the selection of a President of the American Baptist Convention.

Voluntaryism also means that each group has a kind of massive and stubborn stability, inertia, and momentum of its own, deeply rooted in and broadly based on the voluntary consent and commitment of the individuals composing it. Here is the real basis for the tremendous vitality of these denominations. This is likely to become evident in periods of internal stress or of threat to the existence of the group from the outside—as some proponents of mergers have learned to their consternation.

The acceptance of religious freedom by the churches had one important implication that has seldom been noticed. Written into the fundamental laws of the land at a time when rationalism permeated the intellectual world, it embodied the typically rationalist view that

only what all the religious "sects" held and taught in common (the "essentials of every religion") was really relevant for the well being of the society and the state. Obversely this meant that the churches implicitly accepted the view that whatever any religious group held *peculiarly* as a tenet of its faith, must be irrelevant for the public welfare. Thus in effect the churches accepted the responsibility to teach that the peculiar views or tenets or doctrines that divided them one from another and gave each its only reason for separate and independent existence, were either irrelevant for the general welfare or at most possessed only a kind of instrumental value for it. It is little wonder that a sense of irrelevance has haunted many religious leaders in America ever since.<sup>17</sup>

### C

The third element to be noted is the place of the mission enterprise in the life of the denominations.

Since the free churches of America are voluntaristic and purposive the defined objectives of a group are peculiarly definitive and formative.

It is a commonplace that Pietism became dominant in the American churches at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Pietism as a movement in the churches stressed personal religious experience and commitment, expressed in Christian works of evangelization and charity. Hence a concomitant of Pietism wherever it appeared—in German Lutheranism, in English Methodism, in American colonial revivals—was always a renewed interest in missions. Thus the tendency of Pietism as of voluntarism, is to place the central emphasis on the objectives of the group, which is to make the missionary program of a denomination, both home and foreign, definitive for it.

Missions of course, are an aspect of the broad work of evangelization—the winning of converts through persuasion leading to conversion. But since conversion always takes place in the context of a group, it necessarily has two aspects, the conversion of the individual to God, and the individual's commitment to what the particular group is doing, which defines for him the nature of the Christian life in practice. The two aspects are separable, and the second may come to outweigh the first, placing the denomination under pressures to accept as members all who will cooperate in furthering the work of the local church or denomination—as witness the above quoted Congregationalists' conception of their church. For this reason the originally very exclusive sectarian denominations in America have tended always to move in the direction of loosely inclusive membership.

Further, the fact that the denomination is a voluntary association, has an effect upon the conduct of the over-all evangelistic or mission

program it envisages. Since all depends upon persuasion, various aspects of the program, for example, home and foreign missions, necessarily compete for attention and funds within the denomination. Similarly, the several areas of the foreign field compete, with the result noted by H. W. Schneider, that

in the twentieth century, as well as in the nineteenth, the most popular missionfields were still those areas in which "heathenism" was most spectacular—India, China, and "darkest Africa."<sup>18</sup>

Just as voluntarism and sense of mission forms the center of a denomination's self-conscious life, so they provide the basis for the interdenominational or superdenominational consciousness and cooperation which has been such an outstanding aspect of the American religious life. This is seen in the host of inter- or super-denominational societies—the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, The American Home Mission Society, the Bible Society, the Tract Society, the American Sunday School Union, the Temperance Society, the Colonization and Anti-Slavery Societies, the Y.M.C.A., and the Federal and National Councils. Very typical is the statement of the Interchurch World Movement launched in 1919 as a

cooperative effort of the missionary, educational, and other benevolent agencies of the evangelical churches of the United States and of Canada to survey unitedly their present common tasks and simultaneously and together to secure the necessary resources of men and money and power required for these tasks.<sup>19</sup>

The genius of these movements is the same as that of the individual denominations, namely, to instrument certain defined objectives, in this case of such nature and extent as to enlist the support of individuals in many different denominations. It should be noted that most of these societies were not formed by the cooperative activity of denominations as such, but rather as voluntary associations of individuals from various denominations. In this sense they have been superdenominations, many times in recognized competition with the denominations, as witness for example the Old School Presbyterian attitude toward the A.H.M.S. and the Baptist attitude toward some of the work of the Bible Society.

There have been of course, outstanding examples of genuine cooperation of denominations as such, as for example the Congregational-Presbyterian Plan of Union of 1801 and the later Accommodation Plan, and more recently the Federal and National Councils. But the basic genius is the same, in this case cooperative work for the accomplishment of tasks too large for one group to do alone.

Here is the basis for the persistent American view that an ecumenical movement must begin with working together rather than with

agreement on fundamental theological propositions; on "life and work" rather than "faith and order." This is the way to which American churchmen tend to be committed because of the nature of their long and successful experience in interdenominational cooperation.

Since the missionary enterprise plays such a central and definitive role in an American denomination's self-conscious conception of itself, even slight changes in the basic conception of it, works subtle changes in the character of the denomination itself. Hence an understanding of the changing motifs of missions in America contributes greatly to an understanding of many denominational developments and reactions thereto.

During the formative period of 1783 to 1850, the most prevalent conception of the missionary enterprise in all the evangelical denominations was that of individualistic winning of converts one by one to the cause of Christ. To be sure it was assumed by most that, as Rufus Anderson, Secretary of the A.B.C.F.M. put it in 1845

that point being gained, and the principle of obedience implanted, and a highly spiritual religion introduced, social renovation will be sure to follow.

And he went on specifically to reject as a direct objective of missions the "reorganizing, by various direct means, of the structure of that social system of which the converts form a part."<sup>20</sup>

Similarly, as Wade C. Barclay's second volume of his *History of Methodist Missions* makes clear, the Methodists commonly accepted Wesley's injunctions to his preachers which was written into the first discipline—"You have nothing to do but save Souls." And Bishop McKendree in 1816 had anticipated Rufus Anderson's general position in his answer to the question "What may we reasonably believe to be God's design in raising up the Preachers called Methodists?", which was, "to reform the continent by spreading scriptural holiness over these lands."<sup>21</sup> One cannot say, therefore, that these leaders gave no thought to "social renovation"—but believing as they did that it was not of the essence of the work of the free churches but would automatically follow upon the dissemination of "scriptural holiness," one can say that they took a great deal for granted that time did not bear out.

This general conception of the mission enterprise largely defined the objectives of all the evangelical denominations during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century. In a real sense each became a great missionary organization devoted to pressing the claims of the Gospel as it saw them wherever and however opportunity offered. By the same token, every member was a missionary, either actively and directly as a consecrated worker in the field, or through his enlist-

ment in and support of the common enterprise. Thus the General Assembly declared in 1847, that

The Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.] is a missionary society, the object of which is to aid in the conversion of the world, and every member of this church is a member of the said society and bound to do all in his power for the accomplishment of this object.

It was this that shaped and gave direction to each budding denomination.

But during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth, real belief in the all-sufficiency of this kind of missions declined, at least among those of the top leadership in most of the large denominations. During this period enlightened theological Professors hand in hand with "Princes of the Pulpit"<sup>22</sup> responding to the impact of scientific thinking in the garb of evolution and to the deplorable economic and social conditions in the burgeoning industrial society shaped the "new theology" and the "social gospel." Inevitably as their views came to prevail the conception of the work of the Church underwent changes, and missions were metamorphosed from the simple task of winning converts to which, it was assumed, all else would be added, to the complex task of participating actively in social betterment and reconstruction. Foreign missions, from being simple outposts of Christian evangelization, became outposts of the latest technological, medical, agricultural and educational knowledge and practice being developed in the United States. This view of missions received most frank expressions in the "layman's inquiry" published in 1932 as *Re-Thinking Missions*. "We believe," the inquiry states,

that the time has come to set the educational and other philanthropic aspects of mission work free from organized responsibility to the work of conscious and direct evangelism. We must . . . be willing to give largely without preaching, to cooperate whole-heartedly with non-Christian agencies for social improvement. . . .<sup>23</sup>

This of course was conceived as "Christian" work—but by what standards? Why should the devoted young medical missionary in Japan, China, or India be closely examined regarding his views of the Trinity or the Virgin Birth, or on any other "merely" theological views for that matter? Meanwhile as Professor Winthrop Hudson has made clear,<sup>24</sup> in the United States itself Christianity was so amalgamated and identified with the American way of life that it was difficult for denominational leaders to distinguish what was peculiarly "Christian" in the work from the general culture. In this situation Christian missions were easily metamorphosed into attempts at intercultural penetration.<sup>25</sup> "The Christian" said the laymen's inquiry

will therefore regard himself as a co-worker with the forces within each such religious system which are working for righteousness.<sup>26</sup>

In the long run the results were somewhat embarrassing since while the younger churches thrived in every mission land, yet in general it was easy for the East, for example, to accept the technology while in reaction rejecting the Christianity which had been assumed to be inseparable from it. In brief, the revolt of the "colonial" missionary countries of the East, armed with the latest "Christian" know-how of the West, somewhat undercut belief in this kind of missions, which meant the undercutting of the denominations' conception of their life and work at home.

Here is one root of much of the present confusion and distress in the American denominations. No longer really believing either in the sole efficacy of a simple Christian evangelization, or in the salutary effects of cultural interpenetration under Christian auspices, their purposive core and sense of direction is destroyed and they are set adrift.<sup>27</sup> The one hopeful element in the picture is that this, among other things, is pressing even American churchmen to re-examine the meaning of the Church not only as "life and works" but also as "faith and order."

The same principle applies to such outstanding interdenominational movements within the country as the Y.M.C.A. and the Federal Council. The "Y," a product of the revivalism of the second quarter of the nineteenth century,<sup>28</sup> had as its original objective the evangelization of uprooted men in the traditional fashion. Beginning with this primary purpose it added libraries, reading rooms, inexpensive hotels, and recreational and other facilities as a means thereto. But as belief in simple evangelization declined the facilities themselves tended to take the leading role in the program, until today the primary appeal of the "Y" is likely to be as a community welfare organization which is somewhat embarrassed by its earlier evangelistic emphasis.

The Federal Council originating in 1908, was described by one of its historians as, in effect a marriage of American church unity or cooperative movements with the concern for social service.<sup>29</sup> Thus it reflects the changed conception of the primary work of the Church at the time of its origin as Walter Rauschenbusch clearly stated.<sup>30</sup> It was conceived by such leaders as Graham Taylor as a cooperative movement among the churches in the interests of social justice, and C. Howard Hopkins referred to it as "the climax of official recognition of social Christianity. . . ."<sup>31</sup> Its first outstanding pronouncement was its "Social Creed of the Churches" adopted in the meeting in Chicago in 1912.<sup>32</sup>

On the one hand then, the Council can be seen as an expression



of the basic genius of the American religious organizations—cooperation in the interests of effective evangelization. But on the other hand it reflects the changed conception of “evangelization” from the traditional winning of individual souls to Christ coupled with charitable amelioration of distress to the winning of people to concern for social justice based if necessary upon radical social reconstruction. Inherent in the change was the tendency to substitute social-action for the Christian Gospel of redemption which Visser’t Hooft pointed out in his study of *The Background of the Social Gospel in America* in 1928.

This tendency was vigorously combatted in the denominations by the Fundamentalist movement which insofar was right in conception, but which protested on the basis of a theological position generally so archaic and bankrupt that it had no prospect of widespread appeal to intelligent people. It succeeded merely in helping to identify Christianity with stubborn, recalcitrant reactionism in wide areas of America, and in making “Bible belt” a phrase for ultrasophisticated Menckenes to conjure with.

More recently a much more profound and truly sophisticated theological movement, commonly associated with the names of Reinhold Niebuhr and Henry Nelson Wieman<sup>33</sup> has risen in the denominations, which bids fair to do justice both to the Christian tradition and the American activist genius.

But meanwhile, under the stress of continuing social and political crisis, a genuinely reactionary movement has arisen both inside and from without the denominations which would limit the churches’ work to the earlier conception of individualistic soul-winning. This explains the causes and nature of recent attacks on the denominations and the Council as exemplified in John T. Flynn’s *The Road Ahead*, which accuses the churches of furthering “creeping socialism” instead of confining themselves to saving souls.

#### D

The fourth element to be noted is revivalism.

In the English colonies as uniformity enforced by the civil power broke down (e.g. in New England and Virginia) or where it was not, or not for long, attempted (e.g., in Rhode Island, New Amsterdam-New York, and Pennsylvania), and hence where the religious groups were, or were increasingly dependent upon persuasion and popular appeal for recruitment and support, revivalism soon emerged as the accepted technique of the voluntary churches. Not without protest of course, as witness the long and bitter opposition in all the old line churches, but notably in Congregationalism, Presbyterianism and Anglicanism, where doughty Protestant traditionalists correctly sensed that the revivalists “stressed evangelism more than creed,”<sup>34</sup> and at-



tempted like King Canute and about as effectively to exercise a measure of control over the incoming tides.

Early revival leaders in the colonies like the Tennents among the Presbyterians and Jonathan Edwards of the Congregationalists, who were long accustomed to sober but effective periods of spiritual refreshing in their parishes, apparently stumbled upon the practice, as witness, for example, Edwards' narrative of "surprising" conversions. But they and especially their followers of lesser stature and more tenuous traditional roots, became apt and even enthusiastic pupils and imitators of the glamorous free-wheeling Anglican revivalist, George Whitefield, whose career, like the Sorcerer's great broom in the hands of a less skillful manipulator, was multiplied in innumerable splinters.

But if the situation in the colonies tended to work for the acceptance of revivalism in all the churches, the situation under religious freedom in the new nation tended to make it imperative. As Professor Garrison has succinctly put it,

With 90 per cent of the population outside the churches, the task of organized religion could not be limited to encouraging "Christian nurture" . . . in Christian families, or to ministering to old members as they moved to new places farther west. It had to be directed toward that 90 per cent. What they needed first was not nurture or edification, but radical conversion, . . . [and since they followed] no chiefs, . . . they had to be brought in one by one.

"It is small wonder," he correctly continues, "that the revivalists put on all the heat they could and with some notable exceptions, appealed to the emotions more than to the intelligence."<sup>85</sup> There is the heart of the matter. Revivalism in one form or another became the accepted technique of practically all the voluntary churches, the instrument for accomplishing the denominations' objective of evangelism and missions.

Now a commonly accepted practice, whatever the reasons originally given for it, eventually reveals implications of a systematic nature—and revivalism tended strongly to influence the patterns of thought and organization of the groups affected. The "revival system" came to be much more than just a recruiting technique. Some colonial churchmen correctly sensed this, and many of their predictions regarding the effects of revivalism on the churches were fulfilled in the years following independence. What they saw was that revivalism tends to undercut and to wash out all the traditional churchly standards of doctrine and practice.

There are several reasons why this is so. First, revivalism tends to produce an oversimplification of all theological problems, both because the effective revivalist must appeal to the common people in terms they can understand, and because he must reduce all the complex of issues to a simple choice between two clear and contrasting alterna-

tives. Said one convert of "Priest [John] Ingersoll," as the father of the famous agnostic was called, "He made salvation seem so plain, so easy, I wanted to take it to my heart without delay."<sup>36</sup> How simple it could be made is indicated by "Billy" Sunday's proclamation:

You are going to live forever in heaven, or you are going to live forever in hell. There's no other place—just the two. It is for you to decide. It's up to you, and you must decide now.<sup>37</sup>

Second, the revivalist gravitates almost inevitably toward the idea that "whosoever will may come," and this tendency coupled with the necessarily concomitant stress on personal religious experience in "conversion," tends to make man's initiative primary. Revivalism thus tends to lean theologically in an Arminian or even Pelagian direction with the implicit suggestion that man saves himself through choice. As John W. Nevin complained in *The Anxious Bench*, published in 1843, under revivalism it is the sinner who "gets religion," not religion that gets the sinner.

Thus in the hands of New England revivalists in the line of Timothy Dwight, Lyman Beecher and Nathaniel W. Taylor, Calvinism was "modified" almost beyond recognition by the emphasis placed on their interpretation of "free-will." The foundation of their theological system, said Beecher, was that even God exerts only persuasive power over men.<sup>38</sup> This general emphasis in turn bolsters the voluntaristic notion that converted men by choice create the church—an idea paralleled in the political realm by the notion that the people create the government. And finally an extremely ardent revivalist may take as condescending an attitude toward God as he takes toward the President of the Republic, as when Charles G. Finney declared that "the devil has no right to rule this world" and the people ought "to give themselves to God, and vote in the Lord Jesus Christ, as governor of the Universe."<sup>39</sup>

Third, revivalists are strongly tempted (and have commonly yielded) to stress results and to justify whatever means will produce them. Even Edwards defended the preaching of terrifying "hell-fire" sermons with the comment that he thought it not amiss to try to frighten men out of hell. And Finney and his friends justified their "new measures" largely on the ground that they got results, namely conversions. Lyman Beecher and his alter-ego, Nathaniel W. Taylor, almost made "preachableness" in revivals normative for doctrines, and D. D. Williams has pointed out that for some of their revivalistic heirs in New England

the ultimate standard for judging every doctrine and every practice of Christianity was thus first, Will it help or hinder the salvation of men?<sup>40</sup>

This pragmatic emphasis on results reached a peak in the eminently persuasive albeit muddled thinking (when judged by any rigorous standards) of Dwight L. Moody who reputedly said he was an Arminian up to the cross but Calvinist beyond—and who declared forthrightly that “It makes no difference how you get a man to God, provided you get him there.”<sup>41</sup> This emphasis culminated in the spectacular career of “Billy” Sunday and his professional imitators with their elaborate techniques for assessing *their* contribution to the Kingdom of Heaven and the Church of Christ on earth by counting the number of *their* converts. It is probably small wonder that the outstanding historian of Christianity in America, a Methodist, rather easily equated the numerical size of the several denominations with their significance and influence in the American culture.

Fourth, revivalism as voluntarism, tended to bring a particular type of leader to the fore—men close to the people who could speak their language and rouse their emotions. During this formative period it is notable that educated, cultured, dignified religious leaders and ecclesiastical statesmen, men like Timothy Dwight, John Witherspoon, William White—tend to be replaced in the denominations by demagogic preachers and revivalists—men like Peter Cartwright, C. G. Finney, Henry Ward Beecher, Joseph Smith.

This tendency should be seen in the context of the general leveling or equalitarian trend of the times. The parallel development in the political sphere is striking. With the passing of the older revolutionary leaders, the removal of restrictions on popular suffrage, the removal of the barriers between the people and the government, the shift from Federalism and Jeffersonianism to Jacksonian democracy, the “orator” able to appeal in Congress to his peers declined in importance and the popular leaders of the masses increased in influence.<sup>42</sup> Lord Bryce in commenting on the Presidency contrasts the “intellectual pigmies” who followed Jackson with the men of education, administrative experience, largeness of view, and dignity of character who had preceded.

Finally, as revivalism came to pervade the denominations with its implication that the Christian life was a struggle across dull plateaus between peaks of spiritual refreshing, not only was “Christian nurture” in the churches slighted, it was given a reverse twist. Bushnell pointed this out in his complaint that far from encouraging the child to grow up in the Church as a Christian, never knowing himself to be otherwise, the revival system encouraged him to grow up in flagrant sin in order that by contrast he would better know himself as a Christian through the crisis experience of conversion. Thus the revivalists’ emphasis that Christ came to save sinners, had the effect of encouraging the Church

to nurture flagrant sinners in its bosom in order that they might be "gloriously saved."

Not only did revivalism thus tend to a neglect of the Christian nurture of children in the Church, it tended also to have an adverse effect on the minister as a shepherd of his flock. For inevitably the sober local pastor tended increasingly to be judged by his ability to create the proper build-up and setting for the periodic revival campaigns in his church. And naturally ardent members of the congregation were quick to compare him unfavorably with the more colorful, albeit less responsible, roving evangelists. Many a church prayed the prayer, "Lord, send us a man like Finney!" And the stock answer to decline and apathy in a local church was to import a forceful revivalist to "revive us again!" just as the stock answer to troubles in the country was the importation of a morally impeccable plumed knight in shining armor to lead a great crusade for spiritual renovation and to throw the rascals out.

Fifth, it is perhaps somewhat anti-climactical to suggest here that revivalism tended to foster an anti-intellectual bias in American Protestantism. The over-simplification of issues, plus the primary emphasis on a personal religious experience, and on tangible numerical results, left little room or encouragement for the traditional role of the Church and its ministers in intellectual leadership.

Revivalism with these tendencies was a central element in the structure of the Protestantism that gained religious freedom and was an important factor in shaping the exercise of that freedom in subsequent years and in forming the denominations. There were those in the formative years who, from the viewpoint of "classical" Protestantism, regarded the sweep of the "revival system" with alarm and voiced a strong and cogent protest. Most notable perhaps was John W. Nevin of the Mercersburg Seminary who in 1843 published his *The Anxious Bench* as an attack on the whole "new measure" revival system which he contrasted with the "system of the Catechism." Similarly Horace Bushnell, a Connecticut Congregationalist, voiced a milder protest in his work on *Christian Nurture* published in 1847. But by and large revivalism made a clean sweep in practically all the denominations. Lyman Beecher noted with some amazement that even Emerson's "corpse cold" Unitarians in Boston attempted to hold revivals, but was inclined to agree with Theodore Parker that they lacked the essential piety and warmth for the work and hence succeeded only in making themselves a bit ridiculous. Among the denominations the Presbyterians probably made the most consistent and determined stand against the more radical effects of the system, and suffered fragmentation, ridicule, and abuse for their defense of traditional standards of

doctrine and polity.<sup>43</sup> Even Lutheranism, its confessionalism undercut by rationalism and pietism, was swept by revivalism, as the replies to Nevin's work indicate and despite the efforts of confessionally minded men from within was probably saved from becoming just another typical American denomination by the great influx of new Lutheran immigrants.

Surveying the scene as a whole, the historian of Presbyterianism in America was not far wrong when he said that "The Great Awakening . . . terminated the Puritan and inaugurated the Pietist or Methodist age of American Church History."<sup>44</sup>

### E

The fifth element to be noted is the churches' general flight from "Reason" in reaction against the Enlightenment during the Revolutionary Epoch, and the concomitant triumph of Pietism in most of them.<sup>45</sup>

The two live movements affecting Christianity during the eighteenth century were Rationalism (Deism in religion) and Pietism. During that century the foremost politico-ecclesiastical issue in America was religious freedom. Confronting this practical issue, Rationalists and Pietists could combine forces against the defenders of the right wing or traditional position of Establishment, in spite of basic theological differences. This they did, bringing the issue to successful culmination in the provisions for religious freedom written into the new constitutions of the States and the Federal Government. In brief, it is not too far wrong to say that rationalists conceived and shaped the form of the new government, while pietistic sentiments were riding to dominance in the churches.

But once religious freedom was accomplished and a popular interpretation of the French Revolution in America brought the theological issue of "Reason" *versus* Revelation to the fore, pietism rapidly realigned itself with classical, right-wing, scholastic orthodoxy in opposition to rationalists and all their works—now included under the blanket term "infidelity." By and large, except perhaps for Unitarianism, the bulk of American Protestantism turned against the ethos of the Enlightenment, and thereafter found itself either indifferent to or in active opposition to the general spirit and intellectual currents of modern western civilization. Thereafter the bulk of American Protestantism was moulded primarily by pietistic revivalism and scholastic orthodoxy. The former made personal subjective religious experience basic, while scholastic orthodoxy defined the professed interest and content of theology. This provides a fair definition of evangelical Protestantism in America.

This triumph of pietistic revivalism in the American denomi-

nations, associated as it was with the strong reaction against the ideas and spirit of the Enlightenment which were to inform modern civilization, has had far reaching effects on their thought and life. Pietism as a movement has been peculiarly amorphous in character and intellectually naive. The early leaders, intent on cultivating individual Christian piety in the churches—whether Spener and Francke in German Lutheranism, or the Wesleys in English Anglicanism—never conceived their work except as a movement within the saving forms of a church in the interest of revitalizing its Christian life. Only so does Wesley's use of the text, "Is Thine heart . . . as my heart? . . . If it be, give me thine hand"<sup>46</sup> make sense. And if the context of a church is absent this can and has led to strange bedfellows for Christians. For Pietism, cut off from the forms of a traditional church and itself the guiding genius of a denomination, has successively loaned itself to whatever live movement seemed to give structure to current problems and their solutions.

Thus, as suggested, it loaned itself to the battle for religious freedom as structured by the Rationalists in the eighteenth century. During the Revolutionary Epoch when the issue seemed to be "reason" *versus* revelation, it as easily loaned its warm heart to hard headed reactionary scholastic orthodoxy and its structuring of that issue. However this alignment was largely on the theological question, and at the same time on the side of "moral and social ideals and attitudes" the emerging modern age was accepted. Here is the real basis for that strangely divided or schizophrenic character of American Protestantism that has baffled so many historians and observers. The two Randalls, John Herman Senior and Junior, stated the situation clearly in their *Religion and the Modern World* of 1929:

Western society confronted the disruptive forces of science and the machine age with a religious life strangely divided. On the side of moral and social ideals and attitudes, of the whole way of living which it approved and consecrated, Christianity had already come to terms with the forces of the modern age. . . .

On the side of beliefs, however, Christianity in the early 19th century had not come to terms with the intellectual currents of Western society. It found itself, in fact, involved in a profound intellectual reaction against just such an attempt at modernism. . . .

Thus it was that Christianity entered the 19th century with its values belonging to the early modern period, to the age of commerce and individualism, and its beliefs thoroughly medieval and pre-scientific.

This schizophrenia has affected every area of the American denominational life and work. It helps to explain why during the course of the nineteenth century the denominations so easily came to sanctify the ideals and spirit of the rising industrial, acquisitive, bourgeoisie society until by the end of the century there was almost complete



identification of Christianity with "the American way of life" until, as Henry May put it, "In 1876 Protestantism presented a massive, almost unbroken front in its defense of the social status quo."<sup>47</sup>

It also helps to explain why Protestants could accept the "democratic way" with passionate fervor in practice, but fail to develop a critical Protestant theory of the Christian individual as a ruler. Yet in the democracy every man as a citizen, even though a Christian, is by definition a responsible ruler and cannot be set over against the magistrate and the State as under some other forms. The extent of this failure on the part of American Protestantism is indicated by the fact that when, following the Civil War, some churchmen, motivated at least by humanitarian concerns addressed themselves to pressing social problems they soon found as did Walter Rauschenbusch for example, that if they were to embark upon "Christianizing the Social Order" they had to find or create "A Theology For the Social Gospel." And if they be criticized, as they often are, for being more creative than Christian in this respect, it should also be remembered that there was little in the then current theology of the pietistic orthodoxy of the denominations upon which to build such a theology.

But again, when it was widely accepted that, as Francis Greenwood Peabody put it in 1900,

the social question of the present age is not a question of mitigating the evils of the existing order, but a question whether the existing order itself shall last. It is not so much a problem of social amelioration which occupies the modern mind, as a problem of social transformation and reconstruction<sup>48</sup>

then wide areas of the predominantly pietistic churches easily loaned themselves to identification of the Christian Gospel with this endeavor. Men like George D. Herron, and even Walter Rauschenbusch, came close to blurring the line between Christianity and Socialism, as their heirs sometimes tended to equate it with "New Deals," with "Fair Deals," and "Crusades."

More recently we have seen a clash between the earlier evangelical pietistic view that separation of Church and State means that the churches shall confine themselves to "saving souls" and say nothing about social, economic, and political problems, and the later identification of the Christian message with concern for social betterment and reconstruction. Thus Stanley High professed to speak for those who were shocked by what took place at Amsterdam—

But the most disturbing fact in this listing of alleged capitalist evils [by the Amsterdam Conference] is the revelation of how far the church—at least in the persons of its ecclesiastical leadership at Amsterdam—has transferred its concern from the spiritual business of converting man to the secular business of converting man's institutions.<sup>49</sup>



The nature of the reaction against the eighteenth century during the Revolutionary Epoch, also meant that the "free churches" accepted religious freedom in practice but rejected the rationalists' rationale for it. And finding within the right-wing scholastic orthodox tradition that they fell back upon little theological basis for the practice, the denominations have never really worked out a Protestant theological orientation for it. Here is the basis for a widespread psychosomatic indigestion in American Protestantism, since it can neither digest the Enlightenment's theory nor regurgitate its practice.

A. N. Whitehead noted that "the great Methodist movement"—roughly equivalent to my "pietistic-revivalism"—marks the point at which "the clergy of the western races began to waver in their appeal to constructive reason."<sup>50</sup> In comments above on voluntarism and revivalism it was suggested how and why these tended to foster a general anti-intellectualism in the denominations. The present comments on the reaction against the eighteenth century suggest how and why such anti-intellectualism was made official. In brief, at this point evangelical Protestantism, as defined above, parted company with the intellectual currents of the modern world. Thereafter the former defined "religion," while the latter defined "intelligence." Hence since around 1800 Americans have in effect been given the hard choice between being intelligent according to the standards prevailing in their intellectual centers, and being religious according to the standards prevailing in their denominations.

This is really no secret. In fact, one of the most commonly accepted generalizations is that the churches during the nineteenth century largely lost the intellectuals. In America as early as 1836, Orestes A. Brownson noted, that

Everybody knows, that our religion and our philosophy are at war. We are religious only at the expense of our logic [or knowledge].<sup>51</sup>

At about the same time, a more orthodox brother expressed approximately the same sentiment in more euphemistic fashion. "There is," he said

an impression somewhat general—that a vigorous and highly cultivated intellect is not consistent with distinguished holiness: and that those who would live in the cleanest sunshine of communion with God must withdraw from the bleak atmosphere of human science.

Or, as he finally put it more bluntly toward the end of the same article, "It is an impression, somewhat general, that an intellectual clergyman is deficient in piety, and that an eminently pious minister is deficient in intellect."<sup>52</sup> His article, contrary to his purpose, leaves one with the feeling that the impression was not unfounded.

And only yesterday Hugh Hartshorne upon his retirement after many years spent as a Professor of Psychology of Religion in the Yale

Divinity School, stated as his mature conclusion that what is called "theological education" in America "is neither theological [according to theological standards] nor education [according to accepted educational standards]."<sup>53</sup> Not unnaturally many, unable to achieve such clarity or accept the situation with such candor, became schizophrenic trying to be intelligent in the schools and religious in the churches. They could be whole in neither. A student entering our theological schools recently, said to me, "In college all my basic interests were religious, but I couldn't seem to find a place to express them in any denomination." Exactly so.

This situation helps to explain why educational leaders in our great Universities, the centers of our burgeoning intellectual life, have never quite known what to do with theological schools in their midst which pretended to train ministers for local parishes. Meanwhile, "practical" churchmen in the United States have by and large been suspicious of nothing more than University education for ministers, unless at every point it could be made obviously applicable to the immediate practical concerns of the churches.

Hence it might be said that the real patron of administrators in University related Seminaries is Janus—who aside from his exceptional physical and mental equipment which enabled him always to face in two directions at once and to speak from either of two mouths, is described as the "guardian of portals and patron of beginnings and endings." Indeed, such Seminaries have been possible largely because men so gifted have been willing to engage in a kind of consecrated duplicity which has permitted the long-range intellectual task of theological reconstruction required by the Universities to be carried on under the guise of ministering directly to the practical needs of local parishes. Whether or not the work of these men abstractly considered is "good" or "evil" is a question purely "academic." It is a necessary work, and I am willing to leave the question of their ultimate salvation with the pronouncement of highest authority that "with God all things are possible." But we ought to be aware that the very success of their necessary work is apt to lure some into the supposition that a kind of subterfuge is of the essence of the religious life in the modern world. Here is the knotty problem that our tradition poses for us.

## F

The sixth and final formative element to be noted is the situation of competition between the denominations. In good rationalistic theory, which was basic, competition among the several religious sects, each contending for the truth as it saw it, was of the essence of the free-church idea under the system of separation of Church and State—and

was, indeed, the true guarantee of the preservation of "religious rights," as James Madison suggested in the 51st Federalist Paper.

The free-churches were not reluctant to accept this view, and situation, since "in the existence of any Christian sect" the

presumption is of course implied, if not asserted . . . that it is holding the absolute right and truth, or at least more nearly that than other sects; and the inference, to a religious mind, is that right and truth must, in the long run, prevail.<sup>54</sup>

If theoretical considerations made competition between the religious sects acceptable, the practical situation made it inevitable and intensified it. At the time the declarations for religious freedom were written into the fundamental laws of the land there was a large number of religious bodies, each absolutistic in its own eyes. To them such freedom meant the removal of traditional civil and ecclesiastical restraints on free expression and propaganda. These free-churches were confronted with a rapidly growing and westward moving population, around 90 per cent of which was unchurched. This offered virgin territory for evangelization. The accepted technique was revivalism, a way of reaching and appealing to individuals gathered in groups for their individual decision and consent.

These factors combined, worked to intensify the sense of competition between the free, absolutistic groups in the vast free market of souls—a competition that helped to generate the tremendous energies, heroic sacrifices, great devotion to the cause, and a kind of stubborn, plodding work under great handicaps that transformed the religious complexion of the nation. But it cannot be denied that, as L. W. Bacon said of a specific situation during the colonial period that many times

the fear that the work of the gospel might not be done seemed a less effective incitement to activity than the fear that it might be done by others.<sup>55</sup>

This of course was competition between Christian groups sharing a common Christian tradition and heritage, and indeed, really in agreement upon much more than they disagreed on. It was not competition between those of rival faiths, but competition between those holding divergent forms of the same faith—and probably not the less bitter for being thus a family quarrel. This fact meant that ever changing patterns of antagonism and competition were developed, and, by the same token, ever changing patterns of alignments and cooperation.

Robert Baird in his *Religion in America*, first published in America in 1844 at the time when the competition was most keen, divided all the denominations into the "Evangelical" and the "Unevangelical." The former

when viewed in relation to the great doctrines which are universally conceded by Protestants to be fundamental and necessary to salvation . . . all form but one body, recognizing Christ as their common head.<sup>56</sup>

The latter "either renounce, or fail faithfully to exhibit the fundamental and saving truths of the Gospel."

Roman Catholics belong to the latter classification for although "as a Church [they] hold those doctrines on which true believers in all ages have placed their hopes for eternal life" yet they "have been so buried amid the rubbish of multiplied human traditions and inventions, as to remain hid from the great mass of the people."<sup>57</sup> According to Baird, then, Roman Catholics stood in a special category. The great unbridgeable division was between those who "recognize Christ as their head" and those who did not. Notable among the latter were Unitarians, but Universalists, Swedenborgians, Jews, Deists, Atheists, and Socialists were also included. This commonly accepted schematic categorization set the patterns of competition and cooperation among and between the groups.

A Roman Catholic threat could unite all the other groups—even the Evangelical and Unevangelical—in a common front of opposition, especially when as in the west attention was directed to the supposed social and political threat of the Catholic Church to "free institutions."<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, evangelicals might upon occasion borrow a weapon or accept aid and comfort from Roman Catholics in opposition to Unevangelicals. Evangelicals would of course unite against Unitarians and Universalists. Conservative Unitarians might in the stress of conflict with "the latest form of infidelity," seek substantial aid from the staunchest of the orthodox, as when Andrews Norton of Harvard had the Princeton Presbyterian attacks on Transcendentalism reprinted in Boston.<sup>59</sup> Baptists and Methodists, although the outstanding antagonists on the frontier, might easily combine against Presbyterians and Episcopalians. But finally each sect stood by itself against all others, a law unto itself in defense of its peculiar tenets which it inherently held as absolute.

The general effect of such competition was an accentuation of minor as well as substantial differences—the subjects of baptism and its proper mode, ecclesiastical polity, the way of conducting missionary work, pre and post millennialism, "Vater unser" versus "Unser Vater" in the Lord's prayer<sup>60</sup>—and a submergence of the consciousness of a common Christian tradition. Further, such competition helped sometimes to make sheer stubborn perpetuation of peculiarities a chief objective of a group long after real understanding of and hence belief in them had faded into limbo. And lastly, it many times produced a somewhat less than charitable attitude toward other Christian groups,

and even the kind of sardonic jealousy reflected in the reputed remark of the Baptist revivalist who in commenting on his meetings said, "We won only two last night, but thank God the Methodists across the street did not win any!" In the long run these more questionable results of the competition have been most obvious and most generally lamented.

Nevertheless, it must be recognized that such competition and conflict is inherent in the system of free churches, and as Talcott Parsons had observed, it would exist "even if there were no prejudice at all, . . . a fact of which some religious liberals do not seem to be adequately aware." In contemporary terms, this is "a struggle for power among [the] religious denominations,"<sup>61</sup> as each tries to extend itself. So long as the total membership of the denominations was but a fraction of the total population, this aspect of the competition was largely obscured. But as the percentage of total church membership rises higher and higher, it becomes increasingly clear that each may be seeking to extend itself at the expense of others, as for example, when Southern Baptists "invade" Northern (now American) Baptist territory, and Roman Catholics "invade" traditionally Protestant rural areas.

Meanwhile, however, other factors noted in this paper have tended to a general erosion of interest in the distinct and definable theological differences between the religious sects that historically divided them, until increasingly the competition between them seems to be related to such non-theological concerns as nationality or racial background, social status, and convenient accessibility of a local church. Finally what appears to be emerging as of primary distinctive importance in the pluralistic culture is the general traditional ethos of the large families, Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish.<sup>62</sup> Thus so far as Protestants are concerned, in the long run the competition between groups inherent in the system of separation of church and state, which served to divide them, may work to their greater unity.

1. K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, IV (1941), 424. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

2. Philip Schaff, *Church and State in the United States*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1888, p. 23.

3. Saul K. Padover (ed.), *The Complete Jefferson*. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc., 1943, p. 940.

4. I have used the listing in Willard L. Sperry, *Religion in America*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1946, p. 182.

5. See W. W. Sweet, *The American Churches, An Interpretation*. Nashville:

Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948, p. 42. Extensive statistical tables are found in Daniel Dorchester, *The Problem of Religious Progress*. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1881, pp. 538-40.

6. A. N. Whitehead, *Essays in Science and Philosophy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948, p. 115.

7. *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, IV, 428. I have developed this idea at some length in "The American People, Their Space, Time and Religion," soon to be published in the *Journal of Religion*.

8. John W. Nevin, "The Seet System," *Mercersburg Review*, I (1849), p. 499.
9. J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur, *Letters From an American Farmer*. Reprinted from the original edition with a Preface by W. P. Trent and an Introduction by Ludwig Lewisohn. New York: Fox, Duffield and Co., 1904. p. 66.
10. Quoted in Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts 1630-1650*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1933. p. 160.
11. There was in America, in this sense, a widespread reversion to "primitive Christianity," somewhat as defined by Ernst Troeltsch, which has suggested to me the possibility of adapting the "frontier thesis" of Frederick Jackson Turner to the interpretation of Christianity in America in a fashion more profound than that achieved by Peter Mode and W. W. Sweet. Turner's thesis hinges upon the reduction to primitive conditions on the frontier, followed by rebuilding, incorporating new elements derived from the local situation. Regarding all of America as the "frontier" of western Christendom, the prevailing ideal there was patterned after primitive Christianity—hence the tendency to overlook all of Christian history since the first century. The emergence of the denominational form represents the rebuilding, incorporating new elements—the subject of this article. The rebuilding is still going on as American Christianity becomes increasingly conscious of world Christianity and of history.
12. Henry Wilbur Foote, *Thomas Jefferson, Champion of Religious Freedom, Advocate of Christian Morals*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1947, pp. 51-52.
13. See for example Jerald C. Brauer's *Protestantism in America* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953)—an interpretation woven around these two themes.
14. "The Seet System," *Mercersburg Review*, I (1849), p. 499.
15. G. G. Atkins and Frederick L. Fagley, *History of American Congregationalism*. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1942. p. 342.
16. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*. Trans. by Henry Reeve. Fourth edition. New York: J. & H. G. Langley, 1841. I, 335.
17. I have developed this view at length in "Thomas Jefferson's 'Fair Experiment,' Religious Freedom," *Religion in Life*, XXIII (Autumn 1954), 566-579.
18. *Religion in 20th Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1952. p. 44.
19. Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 45.
20. *The Theory of Missions to the Heathen, A Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Edward Webb as Missionary to the Heathen, Ware, Massachusetts, October 23, 1845*. Boston: Press of Crocker and Brewster, 1845.
21. *History of Methodist Missions*. New York: Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Meth. Church, 1950. II, 8.
22. See Winthrop S. Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. Chapter viii.
23. *Re-Thinking Missions; A Laymen's Inquiry after One Hundred Years*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932. p. 326.
24. *The Great Tradition*. . . , chapter ix, "The Church Embraces the World."
25. See for example, Archibald G. Baker, *Christian Missions and a New World Culture*. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1934. "Introduction."
26. *Re-Thinking Missions*. . . p. 327.
27. By the same token, those whose conception of the mission enterprise has not changed materially, have, within their limits, suffered less confusion—as witness for example, the Seventh-day Adventists and the "faith missions."
28. C. Howard Hopkins, *History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America*. New York: Association Press, 1951. p. 4.
29. John A. Hutchison, *We Are Not Divided*. New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1941. p. 25.
30. *Christianizing the Social Order*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1914. pp. 14-15.
31. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism 1865-1915*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1940. p. 302.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 316.
33. Walter M. Horton, "Systematic Theology," in Arnold S. Nash (ed.), *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century: Whence and Whither?* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951. pp. 114, 117.
34. Winfred E. Garrison, "Characteristics of American Organized Religion," in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 256 (March 1948), p. 19.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
36. Herman E. Kittredge, *Ingersoll, a Biographical Appreciation*. New York: Dresden Publishing Co., 1911. p. 23.
37. Quoted in William G. McLoughlin's manuscript study of "Billy" Sunday, chap. iv, p. 10, from the *Boston Herald*, Dec. 9, 1916, p. 3, and used here with permission. Mr. McLoughlin's study is to be published soon by the University of Chicago Press, under the title, *Billy Sunday Was His Real Name*. It is an exceptionally fine study, and will round out the picture of the period given by Hopkins, May, Abell, Visser 'tHooft, and others, by presenting its revivalistic side.
38. *Autobiography, Correspondence, etc., of Lyman Beecher, D.D.*, ed. Charles



- Beecher. New York, 1886. I, 156-57; Lyman Beecher, *Works*. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co., 1852-53. II, 155-56.
39. Samuel J. Baird, *A History of the New School*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1868. p. 225.
  40. Daniel Day Williams, *The Andover Liberals*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1941. p. 7.
  41. Quoted in William G. McLoughlin's manuscript study of "Billy" Sunday, chap. v, p. 4, and used with permission.
  42. See Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. p. 51.
  43. See for example, the detailed study by Walter B. Posey, *The Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest, 1778-1838*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1952.
  44. Robert Ellis Thompson, *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895. pp. 34, 95. Leonard W. Bacon, *A History of American Christianity*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900. p. 176.
  45. See my "American Protestantism During the Revolutionary Epoch," *Church History*, XXII (Dec. 1953), 279-297.
  46. John Wesley, *Sermons On Several Occasions*. New York: Lane & Scott, 1851. I, 346-55.
  47. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. p. 91.
  48. *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*. . . . New York: The Macmillan Co., 1900. p. 5.
  49. *Amsterdam and Capitalism*. Copyright Christian Century, Reprinted by special permission, by Spiritual Mobilization, a pamphlet of 7 unnumbered pages. n.d.
  50. *Adventures of Ideas*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933. pp. 27-28.
  51. In Perry Miller (ed.), *The Transcendentalists, an Anthology*. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1950. p. 108.
  52. Bela Bates Edwards, "Influence of Eminent Piety on the Intellectual Powers," in *Writings*. Boston: John P. Jewett and Co., 1853. II, 472; 497-98.
  53. Hugh Hartshorne, "Theological Education and the Churches," *Yale Divinity News*, XLIX (May 1954), p. 1.
  54. L. W. Bacon, *History of American Christianity*, p. 404.
  55. *Ibid.*, p. 194. Note Francis Parkman's comment on the French Jesuit who "was as often a fanatic for his Order as for his faith" and "ardently as he burned for the saving of souls, he would have none saved on the Upper Lakes except by his brethren and himself." *LaSalle and the Discovery of the Great West*. 12th ed. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1880, p. 30.
  56. Robert Baird, *Religion in America*; . . . New York: Harper & Brothers, 1845. p. 220.
  57. *Ibid.*, pp. 269; 269-70.
  58. See for example, Lyman Beecher, *A Plea for the West*. 2d ed., Cincinnati: Truman & Smith, 1835, and Horace Bushnell, "Barbarism the First Danger," in *Work and Play*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. pp. 227-267.
  59. Perry Miller, *The Transcendentalists*, p. 11.
  60. L. W. Bacon, *History of American Christianity*, p. 195.
  61. Talcott Parsons, *Religious Perspectives of College Teaching in Sociology and Social Psychology*. New Haven: The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, n.d., pp. 40, 39.
  62. Oscar Handlin, *The American People in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. p. 222.



## AMERICAN PROTESTANT JOURNALS AND THE NAZI RELIGIOUS ASSAULT\*

FREDERICK K. WENTZ

*Lutheran Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.*

American Protestantism has been unique in its relationship to state and society, and in its ideas on the matter. Yet these ideas have now been challenged, right down to their presuppositions, by the emergence in recent decades of powerful anti-Christian social movements in western civilization. One of these challengers, Nazism, made a significant impact upon American thought in the transition period of the mid-thirties, for it was regarded as a great religious upsurge of an unbaptized nationalism in the heartland of traditional Christendom. Thus in their reaction to Hitler's movement religious spokesmen revealed the basic social attitudes of their groups and provided answers to the question: "How did American Protestants of twenty years ago conceive the role of Christianity in contemporary society?"

To probe that reaction the author studied seventeen representative Protestant journals. Six of these were primarily denominational—*The Christian Register*, *The Churchman*, *Friends Intelligencer*, *The Christian Advocate*, *The Lutheran*, *The Watchman-Examiner*. Three represented sectarian Fundamentalism—*The Sunday School Times*, *The Moody Monthly*, *The King's Business*. Two were broadly theological or intellectual—*Religion In Life*, *Christian Faith and Life*. Two were general non-denominational organs—*The Christian Century*, *The Christian Herald*. Four held special viewpoints for which Nazism had a particular relevance—a Negro publication, *National Baptist Voice*, two socialist journals, *The World Tomorrow* which ceased in 1934 and *Radical Religion* which began in 1935, and *Christendom* with its concern for a unified church in a unified civilization.

Though our concern here, because of limitations of space, is with only one aspect of Nazism, that of the German church's struggle, a word is first in order concerning what was revealed about American religious thought by the impact upon it of Nazism itself, as a socio-political movement. The magazines under study, while generally opposed to the Hitlerites, divided themselves into three basically different reaction patterns. One group of these journals had a primary concern for social justice and for institutional change. They therefore stressed an aggressive fight against Nazism. Seeing oppressed peoples in our

\*Read at the Spring meeting of the Society, Lancaster, Pa., April 23, 1954.

society, these writers sought to alter institutions in their behalf and felt that fascism, including Nazism in Germany, was a serious threat to such efforts. A second group representing the largest segment of Protestantism, showed a primary concern, aside from Christianity and the church, for international peace and the maintenance of individual freedom, for personal and spiritual change within the existing institutional framework. In pursuing these values their opposition to Nazism fell short of an aggressive fight against it. The third group, sectarian Fundamentalist and millennial in viewpoint, were looking for the end of human society and seeking individual salvation. Their interest in the fulfillment of Biblical prediction and their antagonism to "atheism" caused them to oppose Nazism only as one minor example of a host of modern developments to be condemned. These three groupings we shall call left-wing, center, and right-wing.

This three-fold division of reaction-pattern carried over into the discussion of the Nazi religious assault as well. Americans in general and particularly the Protestant press took a keen interest in the troubles Nazism brought on the German churches—both in the direct conflicts with the state and in the internal struggles Nazism inspired. From the beginning when Hitler became Chancellor in early 1933 and received widespread American attention, some journals far exceeded others in their deep and sustained concern, but virtually all the publications under survey expressed themselves repeatedly on this issue in the following five years.

### *Prophetic Religion*

The left-wing group were especially outspoken. Those magazines which opposed Nazism itself primarily because they were seeking social justice observed the German church struggle for its bearing upon the progress of "prophetic religion," that is, religion which seeks God's justice in human society.<sup>1</sup> Included here are *The World Tomorrow*, *Radical Religion*, *The Christian Register*, *The Christian Century*, *Christendom*, *Religion In Life*.

When Hitler came to power in 1933, it was from this group that the earliest American Protestant outcry arose, specifically in the pages of *The World Tomorrow* and *The Christian Century*. In the opening weeks they were censuring German political life. But during the first half-year of Hitler's success these two periodicals also led the Protestant response in this country to the religious issues Nazism raised. They claimed that the German church was reactionary in its politics and thus allied with Nazism, that the transcendent, other-worldly theology of Karl Barth and German Lutheranism lent itself readily to reactionary politics, and that nationalism, potentially a worldwide threat to the Christian tradition, was now joining issue with

Christianity in Germany.<sup>2</sup> This last remained the dominant reaction through the mid-thirties for the whole gamut of Protestant media of communication studied here. On the other hand it was typical only of this left-wing group to give critical emphasis to the reactionary politics involved in German ecclesiastical and theological positions.

In fact these exponents of prophetism were very pessimistic about the German religious scene throughout these years. *The Christian Century* never ceased to feel that German Protestantism was dangerously conservative in politics.<sup>3</sup> In its pages Reinhold Niebuhr continued to detail how Barthian thinking was used by some theologians, especially Gogarten, to rationalize Nazism.<sup>4</sup> During the early months these journalists felt that the Nazi state had by and large subjugated the Protestant church and they never really reversed this decision.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand they did join Americans generally in extolling the courageous resistance of Barth, Niemöller, and the clergymen of the Confessional Church to the encroachments of Nazi ideas and practices upon the church's life. Especially *The Christian Century* became ecstatic, in December of 1933 and on occasion thereafter, about the revival of the fighting spirit of the early martyrs and Martin Luther.<sup>6</sup>

#### THE CLASH OF TWO BLIND FAITHS

Whether they were discussing the internal church struggle between the party of "German Christians" and the confessional group, or discussing the church-state conflict over attempted Nazi "coördination" of the churches, these observers basically interpreted it as political reaction invading the field of religion and meeting resistance from theological reaction. Nazism, itself a tribalism with religious overtones, produced in a church already allied with reactionary politics a nationalistic brand of Christianity. This latter, led by the church party of "German Christians," represented an infrarational faith which mystically sought an immanent God in the life of the German nation. But such irrationalism can only be met by an equal irrationalism, such blind faith opposed only by a similarly blind faith. Thus the transcendent, suprarational and otherworldly theology of Barth and Lutheranism was offering the main resistance. Both in politics and in religion Nazism brought the clash of extremes and the collapse of the middle, leaving no intermediate ground for prophetic religion, defined as the rational faith which worships a God both immanent and transcendent and seeks His justice in the transnational society of men.

The above reaction was expressed in all the left-wing journals, especially as a reminder that only a passionate faith can hope to stand before the enthusiasms Nazism engendered.<sup>7</sup> For them this seemed a newsworthy insight revealed by the German church struggle. Hence

*The World Tomorrow*, though on the defensive before its Marxist constituency for even discussing non-political resistance like the church's,<sup>8</sup> pointed out that Christian leaders evidenced more courage than rationalist liberals in Germany.<sup>9</sup> The church struggle, it said, would not affect German political life, but did show that political movements should steer clear of the realm of religion.<sup>10</sup> *The Christian Register* rejoiced that religion had become important in Germany again and claimed that resistance within the German church to Hitlerism showed how a few men of faith can save a civilization.<sup>11</sup>

However, coupled with admiration for the courage of Karl Barth and the resisting confessional clergymen, was sharp criticism of the intellectual ground upon which they stood. Their reactionary theological position was held to be too remote and otherworldly in its emphasis upon God's absolute transcendence to offer any positive basis for Christian participation in the social struggle. This objection also found repeated expression.<sup>12</sup>

#### TRIBALISM AND SECULARISM

It was Reinhold Niebuhr who most clearly analyzed the church situation as a clash of irrational theologies and who most searchingly attacked Barth's ideas.<sup>13</sup> But he, together with Paul Tillich, consistently set these judgments against a wider backdrop of events. In keeping with their commitment to the prophetic spirit they interpreted the German church struggle in the larger context of contemporary history and of socio-political as well as religious life. Thus just when Barth was the hero in resisting the Nazis, they claimed that his theology helped cause Nazism. And just when American Protestants were saying that Barth's theology and the German Church's struggle for its inner freedom were too limited a defense of the Christian position, Niebuhr and Tillich said that this was the best stand Christians could take in their day of eclipse.

Tribalism was Niebuhr's designation of Nazism and similar nationalist movements whether in politics or in religion. From the standpoint of prophetic Christianity the German church had made the wrong choice since Hitlerism was worse than secular socialism or even atheistic communism. Communism at least maintained the prophet's passion for universal social justice, though without reference to God.<sup>14</sup> "Succinctly stated, nationalism is a pre-prophetic religion and communism is a form of secularized prophecy. Nationalism is the kind of religious sanctification of tribal life which flourished until Amos cried to Israel . . ." <sup>15</sup> Niebuhr wrote in these terms repeatedly and, as contributor to five of the six magazines produced a leading impact for the viewpoint which was widely held by writers for these journals.<sup>16</sup>

However, Paul Tillich gave earliest and most explicit formulation to these ideas. He had himself been a leader of pre-Nazi German religious socialism and had participated in theological controversy with Barth. Writing in *Religion In Life* in the spring of 1934,<sup>17</sup> Tillich described a serious spiritual vacuum produced within Protestantism in the last two centuries. Whereas the Middle Ages had tended toward a demonic or paganized type of Christianity, with its idea of God devoid of human values, the modern age had swung to the other side in a Christian secularism. It was secular in that it regarded the world as completely subject to human reason. It was Christian in that its idea of humanity arose from the Christian idea of love—its unity of the world, optimism of history, and appreciation of the human soul all arising from a Christian background. But secularism, lacking the fervor of religion, created a vacuum which two forces now sought to fill. One, "reminiscent of Old Testament prophecy," took political names like socialism and communism. Unconsciously it reflected continuity with the Christian tradition. Religious socialists in Germany tried to bring it back to a transcendent reference, endeavoring to create a middle ground of Christian humanism between churchmen and socialists. This failed because of the traditional Lutheran position and because influential "Karl Barth, himself a religious socialist in former days, denied any connection between the religious and the humanistic interpretation of the idea of the kingdom of God."<sup>18</sup> Hence Nazism, a second new movement, rushed into the vacuum. It was fully pagan because it denied all the Christian and humanist presuppositions of our civilization when it took nationalism and made the nation divine. The German church had to fight the new paganism but both it and the world church had a more basic struggle with the background of secularism which had created the void paganism now sought to fill.

To all of this Niebuhr added the realization that German Protestantism in previous decades had sought to bridge the gap between itself and modern secular movements by the theological compromise of liberalism which recognized Christian elements in the modern passion for scientific truth. But this rapprochement had failed because the German church had not recognized genuine Christian elements in the passion for social justice on the part of modern democratic and radical political movements. Now, faced by the new paganism, the liberal compromise was doubly ineffective.

In Germany therefore we have the interesting phenomenon of a religious controversy no longer between secularism and religion but between a primitive religion and Christianity. The church which failed to do justice to what was valuable in modern secularism on the political level is now forced to withdraw its concessions to modernism on the cultural level in order to confront a demonic nationalism with the vigor which only

a non-liberal dogmatism can supply. It is a rather unhappy ending of the struggle between traditional religion and secularism.<sup>19</sup> In effect, then, both Tillich and Niebuhr were saying that in the day of opportunity for a Christian humanism both liberalism and Barthianism failed at the point of social justice. Therefore prophetic religion was being caught in the swirl of extremes and crushed between a militantly secular prophetism (communism) and a pagan tribalism (Nazism).

On the other hand it followed for these two analysts that at the present moment in history the seemingly narrow position of Barth and the confessional group was the best defense Christians could make. Since the Christian tradition was no longer a bulwark against the swollen water let the church be an ark to ride out the flood.<sup>20</sup> Thus in 1934 Tillich felt that the Protestant resistance movement was of great though indirect political significance.<sup>21</sup> And Niebuhr by 1937 was recognizing that the German Lutheran Church, fighting narrowly for the right to preach its own gospel, was making a clearer witness than German Catholics who were trying to deal with Hitler on the political level. Nor could he feel that Americans would do any better, noting that here, "if such a situation arose, the issue would probably be so broadened by the condemnation of social evils that it could not be so easily maintained."<sup>22</sup> Niebuhr was markedly pessimistic about Protestant Christianity in the 1930's.

#### TOTALITARIAN CHRISTIANITY

By and large, of course, writers in these left-wing journals did not reflect such deep insight and sustained analysis as these two theologians. In the name of prophetic religion they consistently attacked the tribal religion of Nazism, German faith movements, and the German Christians. They recognized that transcendent theology and reactionary church were fighting Christianity's battle against a sub-Christian faith—they hailed the courage involved and condemned the position taken. And they remained pessimistic about the outcome. In a day of irrationalism the "rational mind can only wait patiently and hopefully and at the moment rather ineffectually until the storm blows itself out."<sup>23</sup> *The Christian Register*, always anxious to relate religion to the contemporary scene, sometimes felt itself as sympathetic to the German Christians as to the Barthians.<sup>24</sup> *Christendom* and *Religion In Life* were mainly involved in the controversy of Liberal versus Neo-orthodox, though most of their writers were of liberal tendencies. With some exceptions,<sup>25</sup> liberal writers, stressing the emphasis put upon reason in the liberal movement, utterly rejected German Christian thought as foreign to themselves.<sup>26</sup> But neo-orthodox writers, feeling that the genius of liberalism was its effort to be modern and related



to contemporary society, saw in the German Christian movement a new liberalism anxious to relate the church to Nazi society.<sup>27</sup> In this critique they joined the Fundamentalists.

*The Christian Century* was campaigning for an aggressive Christian attack upon culture. It was a leader within the whole Protestant press in proclaiming the great age of conflict between nationalism and Christianity and in trumpeting the approach of worldwide church-state struggles. But Editor Morrison, together with Samuel Cavert<sup>28</sup> and Harold Fey,<sup>29</sup> was particularly urging that in the day of the totalitarian state Christianity should take on its full totalitarian nature. By this he meant that it should assert its absolute autonomy and become a civilization in itself.<sup>30</sup> Though he repeatedly stated that this did not mean dominance by the church,<sup>31</sup> his idea was labeled fascist, by *Radical Religion* for instance.<sup>32</sup> He optimistically felt that in the face of nationalism's challenge Christianity should move forward to reshape all of society and culture as the next major advance of the Social Gospel Movement.<sup>33</sup> Though Morrison agreed with the Nazi repudiation of any separation of sacred and secular spheres,<sup>34</sup> and though *The Christian Century* contributor, the Barthian Homrighausen, identified the German Christians with American social gospellers,<sup>35</sup> the editor and his fellow crusaders insisted that the resisting German churchmen were the first shock troops in Christianity's battle with the totalitarian state.<sup>36</sup> That these Germans limited their fight to a defense of the church's inner freedom was unfortunate.<sup>37</sup> Equally inadequate, they pointed out, was the negative solution Americans find in the separation of church and state.<sup>38</sup> Instead Christianity must shape the totality of society.

Thus before the onslaught of swollen nationalism *The Christian Century* counseled Christian attack while Niebuhr thought of the church as an ark riding out the storm. These were the optimistic and pessimistic extremes for advocates of social justice in the name of Protestant Christianity in the mid-thirties.

### *The Great Apostasy*

On the right-wing of Protestantism stood a group of journals whose major concern both on the social scene and in church life was millennialism. Whereas the left-wing carried its interest in social justice over into its discussion of church life, *Christian Faith and Life*, *The Moody Monthly*, *The King's Business*, and *The Sunday School Times* viewed both society and church from a basically theological orientation. In other words, for this study "left" means first of all radical or liberal social ideas and "right" means reactionary or conservative theology first of all. Incidentally, the theology of the "left" was mainly liberal, with an important ferment of neo-orthodoxy, and the social views

of the "right" were mainly reactionary as a by-product of apocalyptic theology.

Just as the left-wing was more interested in the political and theological import of the church struggle than in the detailed progress of German ecclesiastical institutions vis-a-vis the state, so the right-wing mainly commented on the theological conflict involved. Efforts to modify Christianity or to promote Germanic faiths or to deify Hitler caught the attention of these sectarian Fundamentalists more than church-state maneuvers, though they felt that any fusion of church and state was adultery (the "Roman fusion") or annihilation (the threat in Germany).<sup>39</sup> Actually they experienced considerable difficulty getting the German religious picture clear. They fell prey to propaganda repeatedly. Their sharp distrust of Roman Catholicism made it easy for them, as late as 1937, to believe Nazi tales of immorality in monasteries.<sup>40</sup> And their antipathy to atheistic Russia permitted them to repeat the charge of a German magazine that Russians were using statues of Christ, Moses, and Luther as targets in shooting contests.<sup>41</sup> Adding to their uncertainty was the fact that their direct German contact was with free-church Fundamentalists. These German sectarians were mostly Nazis and loudly claimed that their religious life was thriving under Hitler as never before, labeling resisting state-church clergymen as reactionary obstructionists in a new era of religious revival. On the other hand Americans generally were proclaiming the resisting confessional pastors as martyrs for religious freedom and these American sectarians were strongly concerned for religious freedom. As late as June of 1935 *The Moody Monthly's* editors could not decide whether the truth about religious freedom lay with the German Baptists or with American defenders of the Confessional Synod.<sup>42</sup>

However, even while these millennialists failed to separate the entangled threads of the German church struggle, confusing German Christians with Germanic faith movements, for instance,<sup>43</sup> they were quite sure what the trouble was in German religious life. The trouble was Modernism, The Great Apostasy.<sup>44</sup> For a half a century Germany had been the center of this movement to reconcile Christian thought with scientific and modern thought. For decades the Kaiser's militarism and World War had seemed to them the natural fruitage of such "super-intellectualism."<sup>45</sup> They had noted the post-war change in continental theological currents brought by Karl Barth.<sup>46</sup> Especially for the theologians of *Christian Faith and Life*, the World War marked the turning point and they seemed still to dwell in that era, referring to Hitler in passing as a lesser phenomenon possibly produced by the earlier militarism.<sup>47</sup> It is significant that through 1937 this theological

publication so opposed to evolution, naturalism, liberal theology, and the "higher criticism" did not use Hitler extensively as evil illustration for its arguments; its authors simply were not looking directly at the Hitlerite movement. Others of these millennial magazines, noting the generally anti-liberal spirit of the Nazis, were receptive to reports during the first year that the Hitlerites were helping to sweep aside liberal theology.<sup>48</sup>

At any rate, when it became clear that on the one side were thoroughly orthodox Christians battling for religious freedom against Nazis, German Christians, and pagan faiths on the other side, these Fundamentalists were persistent and outspoken in their castigation of the latter. And always it was modernism which lay behind the German horrors. Nazi attacks on the Old Testament were of a piece with "higher criticism."<sup>49</sup> The effort to replace Christ with Woden was the same as liberalism's tendency to make Christianity simply chief among several valid world religions.<sup>50</sup> To deify Hitler was akin to humanism's elevation of humanity.<sup>51</sup> Unlike left-wing thinkers who felt that rationalism and nationalism were widely separate movements, who preferred communism to the tribalism of the Nazis and felt that Christian liberalism was unalterably opposed to the latter, these right-wing writers lumped all such isms together as Godless in their opposition to the Biblically revealed divine religion. They joined Tillich and Niebuhr in positing secularism as the cause of Nazism and communism but they went further and posited liberal theology as the basic cause of secularism. Nor could they join these defenders of prophetic religion in distinguishing secularism, Nazism and communism as three very different things. Especially were they unable to agree that, since liberalism had failed, the church had been remiss in not relating itself positively to the good in modern society. Rather, these apocalyptists claimed, the liberal compromise had been too successful so that the church had not held sufficiently aloof from an evil modern age. Not too little humanism within Christianity but too much had brought on the present troubles. It all proved once more the destructive effect of modernism.

### *Religious Liberty*

#### THE COMMON PATTERN

Though the Biblicist and the champion of social justice each had his special slant, there was a common American Protestant reaction to the German church struggle. It was characteristic of the middle group of journals but it ran through the whole spectrum of expression. It may be summarized as follows. In 1933 American observers expected the German church to capitulate and have its independence

crushed by the totalitarian state. In December they were surprised and impressed at the heroic resistance some churchmen were making, comparable to Luther or the early martyrs.<sup>52</sup> Thereafter pessimism vied with extreme praise, according to the fluctuation of the week's events. Meanwhile this conflict became a symbol. Won or lost, this was the church's first pitched battle in its civilization-wide clash with the modern, magnified state, a clash imminent in the United States as well. The immediate issue was that of religious liberty. Behind it all lay Christianity's world war with nationalism. Thus the German church's troubles attracted considerable interest and made Americans rethink the relationship of their religion to their society.

#### AN INDEPENDENT CHURCH

With this perspective the central grouping of magazines—*The Churchman*, *Friends Intelligencer*, *The Christian Advocate*, *The Christian Herald*, *The Lutheran*, *The Watchman-Examiner*, *National Baptist Voice*—focused attention more upon German ecclesiastical institutions and the state's encroachments than upon the internal theological clash. These representatives of the major Protestant bodies in America were concerned for religious liberty primarily, rather than for prophetic religion or the defeat of modernism, just as in political matters their concern was for freedom more than for social justice or Biblical prophecy. Often they criticized the limited stand taken by the German church, as when *Friends Intelligencer* typically tempered its praise for the resisting pastors with regret that they did not with equal vigor oppose the hatreds Nazism engendered.<sup>53</sup> But more frequently they rejoiced that freedom of religion was tenaciously asserted in the face of an all-embracing Hitlerism. Barth and Niemöller took on heroic proportions. So significant did the German witness to the principles of religious liberty seem that *The Christian Advocate* claimed that more than resistance to the principles of Hitlerism was involved. "The foundations of the opposition go far deeper," it stated. "They rest upon the belief that the Church should not submit to governmental dictation."<sup>54</sup> Luther had insisted on freedom to proclaim the Gospel; his spiritual successors were still insisting upon that sacred principle.<sup>55</sup>

However, Americans had an important piece of advice to give to continental ecclesiastics: They should entirely separate their churches from the state. Practically all the Protestant media of expression had that suggestion.<sup>56</sup> Even *The Christian Century*, the advocate of totalitarian Christianity, recommended separation repeatedly, though Morrison labeled it a negative step only and, after watching closely the German church struggle and attending the Oxford Conference in 1937, he seemed to grow in appreciation of the state-church position.<sup>57</sup> But it was the middle group of periodicals which were inclined to think of

separation as important because they saw the problem mainly as one of independence for the church. Despite its spiritual bond with the state church of England, the freedom-conscious *The Churchman* felt that one lesson Hitlerism taught America was that the "traditional tie-up between church and state in Germany has not only tended to cloud the issues at stake, but it has hindered the free action of Protestants and Catholics."<sup>58</sup> *The Christian Advocate* and others echoed this sentiment.<sup>59</sup> "But how can these pastors protest as they should," asked one spokesman, "while their salaries are paid by the state?"<sup>60</sup>

*The Watchman-Examiner* went further and offered separation as the basic solution to the problem. Its main reaction was: Let embattled German churchmen learn the great Baptist principle of separation of church and state. This attitude was reenforced by frequent reports from German Baptists that Hitler was the friend of free churchmen and his era one of revival for their work.<sup>61</sup> In contrast to *The Christian Advocate*, which repudiated the efforts of its Nazified Methodist brethren in Germany to make capital of the persecution of the state-church Lutherans,<sup>62</sup> *The Watchman-Examiner* used that situation as proof that Baptists are right in insisting on separation. When Jesus enjoined "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's," he meant keep church and state separate, and "now the day has come when state churches must pay for the alliance which the Lord Jesus commanded should never be undertaken."<sup>63</sup> If German churchmen persist in perpetuating the evil which Constantine started, then Hitler is right and the protesting pastors are wrong.<sup>64</sup> Had the church and state been separate, "the troubles the Christians of Germany are now having would never have occurred."<sup>65</sup> The thought is that when the church meddles in politics, which is involved in the state-church situation, then the state can be expected to interfere with religion. As one prominent contributor put it, since "Baptists have not taken part in politics they have had freedom to carry on their services during recent disturbed years."<sup>66</sup>

What is more, the editor of *The Watchman-Examiner* implied that fusion of church and state may be the cause behind the German loss of freedoms other than religious freedom.

How difficult it is for Christ to teach his people what, through obedience, they could so easily learn. Through blood and tears an anguished church will pay increasingly for the folly of a forbidden alliance. For there is a deeper danger present. The opposition of the German state to the church may result in an abridgement of all spiritual liberty. Thus one evil begets another. For when church and state conflict the inevitable trend is the suppression of religious freedom, which always is accompanied by the limitation of secular freedom. Each private religious right has its complementary private civil right. The church allied to the state, being

disciplined by the state, will suffer not merely as to regulation of its affairs but also in matters of private conscience, beliefs and liberties.<sup>67</sup>

The whole of a nation's life is served better by a free church, he added, because a free church is "the organ of the revelation of divine truth, the voice of a merciful God, the light that lighteneth every man, the comfort of sovereigns and the peaceful guide of princes and rulers."<sup>68</sup> When it is noted that these ideas appeared in a magazine which repeatedly abjured any interest in politics,<sup>69</sup> and that this major editorial, written in 1937, made no explicit reference to the wider enslavement already brought to Germany by the Nazis, an underlying assumption becomes evident. It is that not only church and state but also religion and politics should be carefully divorced, except as religion is "the comfort of sovereigns and the peaceful guide of princes and rulers."

#### AMERICAN PARALLELS

The Nazi religious situation evoked from American authors considerable discussion of similar problems in this country. Most frequently it was religious liberty which seemed jeopardized.<sup>70</sup> But the examples cited varied widely. For the millennialists, who found modernism as the root cause, the evidences in this country were legion. The search for an Aryan Messiah sounded to them like the tendency of some American schools to make Christianity one among many religions or the suggestion of Hocking's Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry that there be "a missionary *rapprochement* with Asiatic heathenism."<sup>71</sup> Or the German scene was a reminder that church unionism is frequently just a movement to get rid of creeds.<sup>72</sup> Again, the Nazi rejection of theological students belonging to the Confessional Synod was equated with the rejection from Presbyterian pulpits of the products of ultra-Fundamentalist Westminster Seminary.<sup>73</sup> In contrast to German universities, it was said, today the attack upon Christianity in this country is still led by the theological seminaries.<sup>74</sup> Similarly, *The Sunday School Times* in 1936 reported that the "method that Unitarianizers are using in America, that is, to capture control of the church and to force out those to whom the church rightly belongs," was now recommended for supporters of the "New Heathenism" in Germany.<sup>75</sup> And one commentator declared that the radical German Christians were, like all heretical sects, basically opposed to Paul's theology. Such groups "may be as far as East from West . . . but at nightfall they all are found crouching about the same anti-Pauline campfire—Unitarian, Christian Scientist, Spiritist, Modernist, Russellite, and now left-wing Nazi."<sup>76</sup>

The other two groups overlapped more in their identification of Nazilike nationalism in American religion. However, for the leftist thinkers, besides the fascism of Roman Catholicism,<sup>77</sup> Buchmanism was



a prime target. Its emphasis on individual guidance and the dictatorship of the Holy Spirit drew fire as fascistic and socially naive.<sup>78</sup> *The Christian Century* found parallels in American court decisions against Jehovah's Witnesses who refuse to salute the flag, and in the suggestion of WPA subsidies to churches.<sup>79</sup> On the other hand, *The Lutheran* claimed that *The Christian Century* itself had the theology of the German Christians.<sup>80</sup>

The middle group scattered its American parallels most widely as each journal dwelt upon its own special theme or was struck by some one facet of religious Nazism. Thus *Friends Intelligencer* felt that pressure toward compulsory military training jeopardized religious liberty in the United States also;<sup>81</sup> *The Nationalist Baptist Voice* said that Americans who condemn the subjugation of the German church should be protesting lynchings in our own land;<sup>82</sup> and *The Christian Herald* compared Hitler's German God to the tribal deity Father Coughlin must have addressed in praying against American participation in the World Court.<sup>83</sup> But it was *The Christian Advocate* which was most persistent in bringing the German church troubles onto the American scene. In fact the application back home seemed its major reaction to these European events. Anti-semitism in a Methodist journal in Germany called to mind the Know Nothing Party and the church's treatment of Negroes in this country. "If the Methodists of Germany live in a glass house," concluded one editorial, "so do we. God amend and guide us all!"<sup>84</sup> German attacks on the Old Testament called forth the reminder that Americans also "are repealing it piecemeal."<sup>85</sup> The pagan calendar proposed for the Fatherland seemed parallel to our pagan Easter rabbits.<sup>86</sup> Generally editorials in *The Christian Advocate* used comment on the German religious scene to exhort Americans to attend to their primary task of preaching and evangelizing so that secularism and paganism will make no further inroads among us.<sup>87</sup>

### Conclusions

#### NATIONALISM IN RELIGION

As has been noted, one of the most pronounced attitudes with which the whole range of American Protestants discussed the German church struggle, was that Christianity faced a world conflict with nationalism and that the German situation marked the first major skirmish. A swollen nationalism, it was held, was exerting a harmful pressure within the sphere of religion itself. However, from the three different viewpoints which have been found throughout this study, three different meanings emerge for this phenomenon, three definitions of nationalism's role within the religious sphere.

For the left-wing publications it was thought of as tribalism, that is, the reversion to particularism. For one thing it was a reversion, a turning back to accept outmoded forms uncritically, a return to the religious sanction of tribal life which was simply pre-prophetic and primitive polytheism.<sup>88</sup> But, more important, it was also particularism—the effort to make a particular people, place, race, or state superior and absolute.<sup>89</sup> Thus religious nationalism was seen to threaten two great characteristics of Christianity—its criticism upon society and its universalism.

On the other hand, for millennial authors nationalism in religion was another manifestation of modernism. As its name implies, modernism was the false effort to be up-to-date by bringing contemporary ideas into Christianity. While both left-wing and right-wing writers viewed the problem as perennial, the former thought in terms of a throw-back in the religious progress of history while the latter saw a portent of the coming religious degeneration. Yet what was worse in the eyes of these right-wing Biblicists was the humanism involved. Whether it was the desire to elevate the Nazi state or the Nazi *Fuehrer* or the Nordic gods it was all labeled a part of man's effort to absolutize something human in rebellion against the absolute Ruler, God. Thus nationalism brought into religion was seen to threaten the ancient uniqueness of Christianity and its transcendent, God-given character. These two threats were one—an attack upon God's special revelation, the Bible.

In the median group the meaning of nationalism's interference in religion was less clear cut. Inclined to think more in terms of *status quo* and Christianity's stake in the present, than of the dynamics of history, and identifying Christianity mainly with the major religious institutions of our society, these journalists found the threat to be mainly to religious liberty and the independence of the church. They were watching the totalitarian state interfere with the church's life. More than the others their anxiety revolved around the total rather than the absolute state, observing the clash of institutions more than that of ideologies.

These divergent attitudes, described in more detail in previous sections of this chapter, were illustrated in the first months of Nazi success. American Protestant spokesmen were generally pessimistic in 1933 about German Protestantism, not expecting those continental Christian forces to evidence much strength in the face of Nazi assaults. But the reasons for this judgment differed. The exponents of prophetic religion placed no confidence in a church which was traditionally identified with monarchical and reactionary politics. Besides, that church was being swept by an other-worldly too-transcendent theology that

made it still more readily the captive of "the powers that be." The middle group doubted the ability to resist on the part of a state church filled with only nominal members. The millennial periodicals thought of the German church as seriously weakened by the liberal Biblical scholarship which had been her infamy in previous decades. The pessimism was a common reaction but the reasons for it varied.

#### THE CHURCH'S ROLE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

What, then, should be the role of the church or the religious forces in contemporary society, as envisioned by these Protestant organs? In a word, they felt that Christianity needed to move toward distinguishing or disentangling itself from our civilization and that this move was now being forced upon it. The close association between the church and western civilization compromised Christianity too much, it was thought.<sup>90</sup> Those reasons for pessimism about the German church, stated in the previous paragraph, were also considered good reasons for anxiety about the world church's welfare, though Germany was an extreme example of this unhealthy condition. When it became clear that the Nazis would not quickly reduce the churches to total acquiescence, American observers rejoiced not only at the resistance but that the issue had finally been joined. Such an open clash will restore respect for the church, show its strength, purify it, and clarify its own thinking.<sup>91</sup> It was thought unfortunate that the struggle was forced by such a fearful enemy and that the German church was the front line of defense, but at least Christianity's easy compromises would be shattered. This was a reaction which ran to a significant degree through the whole range of American Protestant comment. Here, surely, was one of the main effects of Nazism as a whole upon American Christian thought. In 1937 Cavert stated a widely held idea when he said that "we must agree that in the main the church seems headed for an era of conflict with contemporary culture, no longer of easy domestication within it."<sup>92</sup> It is evident from the material of this study that Nazism was a major factor in shaping this conviction.

However, this shift from domestication to conflict once again meant different things to different people. The positions in regard to organized Christianity's task in contemporary civilization were these. The millennial periodicals viewed the church as theoretically withdrawn from civilization and society to await the rapture into heaven, meanwhile winning souls from the world. This meant that the church must drive liberal, compromising theology from its midst so that it would constitute a clear-cut witness to the divinely inspired words of God in Scripture. The middle group, tending to think of the church as a redeeming but stable institution integral to our society, seldom re-

flected comprehensively about a total conflict with contemporary life, at least for the near future in the United States. The task of this influential institution in standing against contemporary culture was held to be the elimination of war from our social fabric and the maintenance of its own independence in the face of increasing statism. Whereas the apocalyptists witnessed to their faith and criticized an evil world, the dominant median group thought of the church in addition as a great influence for righteousness within society. Between these two positions stood *The Watchman-Examiner* with its insistence on the divorcement of religion and politics, favoring a free church which would be an example and kind of free-wheeling conscience to the rest of society. In the left-wing group were at least two positions. Both felt that the church as a prophetic social critic must sever its too ready affiliation with the dominant institutions of an era now passing—capitalism and reactionary, nationalistic political powers. Both pictured its task ideally as that of the leader of the forces of social justice, bringing into being the more humane society of the future—usually thought of as some form of socialistic democracy. But one of these, best expressed in *The Christian Century*, took the optimistic stand that Christianity must withdraw its cultural compromises only to assert aggressively its formative and integrative power over the totality of culture and society. This was to be done apart from any specific religious organization, however. The other left-wing attitude, most persistently elaborated in *Radical Religion*, was pessimistic rather than optimistic. Religion should provide the power to criticize and transcend every other aspect of life. But the church, having failed to provide a rational and just integration of contemporary civilization in past decades, was now being inundated by sub-human currents and must seek desperately to preserve itself and the remnants of a higher culture like an ark in the flood. Other left-wing journalists divided themselves between liberalism like C. C. Morrison's and neo-orthodoxy like Reinhold Niebuhr's, or, more often, fell uncertainly between, possessed of a liberal viewpoint but pessimistic about the immediate future.

1. In this article "prophetic religion" refers to the viewpoint of these left-wing thinkers.

2. Cf., for example, *The World Tomorrow*, April 5, 1933, p. 336; *The Christian Century*, Feb. 15, 1933, p. 213; March 29, 1933, pp. 418-20; April 5, 1933, p. 453; April 26, 1933, p. 551; May 3, 1933, pp. 589-90; May 24, 1933, pp. 683-85; June 28, 1933, pp. 844-45.

3. *The Christian Century*, Sept. 18, 1935, p. 1163.

4. *The Christian Century*, June 6, 1934, pp. 757-59.

5. Cf., for example, *The World Tomorrow*, Nov. 23, 1933, p. 629; *The Christian Register*, Jan. 16, 1936, p. 34; Nov. 19, 1936, p. 694; *The Christian Century*, Oct. 25, 1933, p. 1326; Dec. 13, 1933, p. 1566; Jan. 8, 1936, p. 37.

6. Cf., for example, *The Christian Century*, Dec. 6, 1933, pp. 1523-24; Dec. 13, 1933, pp. 1566-68.

7. Cf., for example, *The World Tomorrow*,

- April 12, 1934, p. 170; July 26, 1934, pp. 378-79; *The Christian Register*, March 8, 1934, p. 158; *Christendom*, Winter 1935-36, pp. 474-75; Summer 1937, p. 488; *Religion In Life*, Spring 1934, p. 169; *The Christian Century*, Dec. 13, 1933, pp. 1566-68.
8. Cf., for example, *The World Tomorrow*, Dec. 21, 1933, p. 679; Jan. 4, 1934, p. 22.
  9. *The World Tomorrow*, Dec. 21, 1933, p. 679.
  10. *The World Tomorrow*, April 26, 1934, p. 196.
  11. *The Christian Register*, March 8, 1934, p. 158; July 5, 1934, p. 446.
  12. Cf., for example, *Radical Religion*, Autumn 1936, p. 17; Summer 1937, p. 12; *The Christian Register*, Sept. 21, 1933, p. 610; Aug. 5, 1937, p. 464; *Religion In Life*, Winter 1937, p. 118; *The Christian Century*, June 6, 1934, pp. 757-59.
  13. Cf., for example, *Christendom*, Winter 1936, pp. 474-75.
  14. These ideas are set forth, for example, in *Radical Religion*, Winter, 1936, pp. 5 and 7; *The Christian Century*, Aug. 26, 1936, p. 1129; Nov. 4, 1936, p. 1452.
  15. *Radical Religion*, Winter 1936, p. 7.
  16. Cf., for example, reference to "reversion of universal Christianity to bald tribalism" in *The Christian Century*, Dec. 13, 1933, p. 1567.
  17. *Religion In Life*, Spring 1934, pp. 163-173.
  18. *Religion In Life*, Spring 1934, p. 170.
  19. *The Christian Century*, Nov. 4, 1936, p. 1452.
  20. *Religion In Life*, Autumn 1935, p. 553.
  21. *Religion In Life*, Spring 1934, p. 166.
  22. *The Christian Century*, Oct. 6, 1937, p. 1240, quoting from a speech.
  23. *Christendom*, summer 1937, p. 488.
  24. *The Christian Register*, September 21, 1933, p. 610; August 5, 1937, p. 464.
  25. Cf. *Religion In Life*, Autumn 1933, p. 545; cf. also *The Christian Register*, Nov. 8, 1934, p. 675.
  26. Cf. for example, *Christendom*, Spring 1936, pp. 515-24; *Religion In Life*, Winter 1937, pp. 112-24.
  27. This was most clearly stated by Pauck and Niebuhr in *Radical Religion* and by Homrighausen in *The Christian Century*, cf. *Radical Religion* Summer 1937, p. 12; Autumn 1937, p. 18; *The Christian Century*, Sept. 19, 1934, p. 1186; Feb. 6, 1935; pp. 174-6.
  28. *The Christian Century*, May 26, 1937, p. 675.
  29. *The Christian Century*, Sept. 1, 1937, p. 1068.
  30. *The Christian Century*, Dec. 13, 1933, p. 1568; Feb. 7, 1934, p. 175; Feb. 14, 1934, p. 214.
  31. Cf. for example, *The Christian Century*, Feb. 14, 1934, pp. 214-15; Aug. 12, 1936, p. 1079.
  32. *Radical Religion*, Summer 1937, p. 16. It was much the same idea which lay behind the founding of *Christendom*, cf. *Christendom*, Autumn 1935, p. 13.
  33. *The Christian Century*, Dec. 13, 1933, p. 1568; Feb. 7, 1934, pp. 174-6; Feb. 14, 1934, p. 215.
  34. *The Christian Century*, May 26, 1937, p. 674.
  35. *The Christian Century*, Sept. 19, 1934, p. 1186.
  36. Cf. for example, *The Christian Century*, Dec. 13, 1933, p. 1568; April 14, 1937, p. 478.
  37. Cf. for example, *The Christian Century*, Feb. 7, 1934, p. 175-6; Feb. 14, 1934, p. 215; May 26, 1937, p. 675; Sept. 1, 1937, p. 1068.
  38. Cf. for example, *The Christian Century*, Dec. 13, 1933, p. 1567; May 26, 1937, p. 675; Oct. 20, 1937, pp. 1288-9.
  39. *The Sunday School Times*, April 20, 1935, p. 276.
  40. *The Sunday School Times*, June 5, 1937, p. 415; Dec. 25, 1937, p. 926.
  41. *The Sunday School Times*, Jan. 16, 1937, p. 38.
  42. *The Moody Monthly*, June 1935, p. 457.
  43. *The Sunday School Times*, June 9, 1934, p. 381.
  44. *The Sunday School Times*, June 19, 1937, p. 444.
  45. *Christian Faith and Life*, April 1934, p. 152; for term "super-intellectualism" cf. *Christian Faith and Life*, April 1934, p. 101.
  46. *Christian Faith and Life*, April 1933, p. 161-3.
  47. *Christian Faith and Life*, Oct. 1935, p. 244-6; *The Moody Monthly*, Dec. 1936, p. 173.
  48. Cf. for example, *The Sunday School Times*, March 11, 1933, p. 172; Dec. 9, 1933, p. 778; June 9, 1934, p. 381.
  49. Cf. for example, *The Moody Monthly*, Nov. 1935, p. 121; *The Sunday School Times*, Jan. 13, 1934, p. 20; *The Moody Monthly*, Jan. 1934, p. 208.
  50. *The Sunday School Times*, Dec. 9, 1933, p. 778; *Christian Faith and Life*, April 1934, p. 103.
  51. *The Sunday School Times*, June 19, 1937, p. 444.
  52. An exception to these two sentences was *The Lutheran* which was more optimistic about fellow Lutherans in Germany and less surprised when the resistance movement broke into the news.
  53. *Friends Intelligencer*, Jan. 5, 1935, p. 4.
  54. *The Christian Advocate*, Nov. 8, 1934, p. 899.
  55. Cf. for example, *The Churchman*, Sept. 1, 1936, p. 9; *The Christian Advocate*, Nov. 8, 1934, p. 899.
  56. *The Lutheran*, while espousing separation in U.S. and debating its value for Europe, generally defended the state-church position for Germany, cf. *The Lutheran*, Nov. 19, 1936, p. 13.

57. *The Christian Century*, Oct. 31, 1934, p. 1367; March 3, 1937, p. 271; May 26, 1937, pp. 675-6 (article by Cavert); especially Oct. 20, 1937, pp. 1288-9.
58. *The Churchman*, Sept. 15, 1935, p. 11.
59. Cf. for example, *The Christian Advocate*, Oct. 28, 1937, p. 978.
60. *The Watchman-Examiner*, January 25, 1934, p. 83.
61. *The Watchman-Examiner*, Jan. 18, 1934, p. 59; Sept. 10, 1936, p. 1021; Sept. 2, 1937, p. 978; June 17, 1937, p. 707.
62. *The Christian Advocate*, Aug. 26, 1937, p. 763.
63. *The Watchman-Examiner*, July 15, 1937, p. 815.
64. *The Watchman-Examiner*, March 21, 1935, p. 303.
65. *The Watchman-Examiner*, Jan. 25, 1934, p. 83.
66. *The Watchman-Examiner*, May 31, 1934, p. 632.
67. *The Watchman-Examiner*, July 15, 1937, p. 815.
68. *The Watchman-Examiner*, July 15, 1937, p. 816.
69. *The Watchman-Examiner*, March 29, 1934, p. 329; June 13, 1935, p. 699.
70. Cf. for example, references to *The Christian Century* and *Friends Intelligencer* below.
71. *Christian Faith and Life*, April 1934, p. 103; *The Sunday School Times*, Dec. 9, 1933, p. 778.
72. *The Sunday School Times*, Dec. 1, 1934, p. 781.
73. *The Sunday School Times*, Feb. 15, 1936, p. 101.
74. *The Sunday School Times*, Jan. 18, 1936, p. 37.
75. *The Sunday School Times*, Sept. 12, 1936, p. 597.
76. *The Sunday School Times*, Jan. 13, 1934, p. 20.
77. Cf. for example, *The Christian Register*, Nov. 26, 1936, p. 726. *The Christian Century*, Dec. 8, 1937, p. 1524.
78. Cf. for example, *The Christian Register*, Sept. 17, 1936, p. 551; *The Christian Century*, March 13, 1935, pp. 328-9.
79. *The Christian Century*, Oct. 23, 1935, p. 1333; Oct. 9, 1935, p. 1270.
80. *The Lutheran*, Sept. 15, 1937, p. 11.
81. *Friends Intelligencer*, Dec. 28, 1935, p. 822.
82. *National Baptist Voice*, Dec. 16, 1933, p. 3.
83. *The Christian Herald*, May 1935, p. 26.
84. *The Christian Advocate*, Oct. 5, 1933, p. 939.
85. *The Christian Advocate*, Nov. 23, 1933, p. 1108.
86. *The Christian Advocate*, March 14, 1935, p. 235.
87. Cf. for example, *The Christian Advocate*, April 19, 1934, p. 364; July 4, 1935, p. 619.
88. *Radical Religion*, Winter 1936, p. 7; Spring 1936, p. 6.
89. Cf. for example, *Radical Religion*, Spring 1936, p. 6; *The Christian Century*, May 26, 1937, p. 675; *The Christian Century*, Aug. 4, 1937, p. 967; *The Christian Advocate*, May 9, 1935, p. 428; *National Baptist Voice*, June 12, 1937, pp. 3 and 5; for *The Watchman-Examiner's* idea of the evil compromise involved in a state church and for the millennial journals' criticism of modernistic compromises, cf. above.
91. Cf. for example, *The Christian Register*, March 8, 1934, p. 158; July 5, 1934, p. 446; *The Christian Century*, March 3, 1937, p. 272; Aug. 4, 1937, p. 967; *Religion In Life*, Autumn 1933, p. 541; *The Churchman*, July 15, 1934, p. 9; April 1, 1937, p. 7; *Friends Intelligencer*, Jan. 20, 1934, p. 37; *The Christian Herald*, Jan. 1934, p. 27; Oct. 1936, p. 43; *The Lutheran*, July 16, 1936, p. 21, quoting Barth; April 14, 1937, p. 5; *The Watchman-Examiner*, July 25, 1935, p. 853; quoting Brunner; *The Sunday School Times*, May 16, 1936, p. 351.
92. *The Christian Century*, May 26, 1937, p. 675.



## THE PALATINATE CHURCH ORDER OF 1563\*

BARD THOMPSON

*Emory University*

The ground and provocation of the German Reformed Church are first considerations in the appreciation of its character. It is understood that the *Palatinate Church Order* of 1563,<sup>1</sup> containing the *Heidelberg Catechism* and the Palatinate liturgy, introduced a permanent Reformed tradition to Germany. It should also be understood that that *kirchenordnung* represented the effort of a Melanchthonian church to maintain its evangelical consciousness against the pressures of Gnesio-Lutheranism. Later Palatinate religion arose thus from the ground of Melanchthonianism and in the context of the Crypto-Calvinist controversy—the creation of Zacharius Ursinus, a pupil of Melanchthon and Martyr, and more deeply of John a Lasco, the Polish reformer whose influence in this connection remains untold.

### I

Protestantism came relatively late to the Palatinate. The Reformation began in 1545—seventeen years after the *Saxon Visitation Articles* (1528) were enacted and the year before the death of Luther. It was the very era when Melanchthonianism (or, the Melanchthonian tendency)<sup>2</sup> was gaining currency in evangelical Germany.

The points of difference between Luther and Melanchthon were realized quite early in their relationship.<sup>3</sup> Melanchthon was pleased to receive Erasmus' *De Libero Arbitrio* in 1524.<sup>4</sup> "For a long time, I have hoped that some careful person would oppose Luther in this matter. Erasmus is the man or I am deceived."<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Erasmus *was* the man! Thereafter Melanchthon

rejected the Stoic and Manichaeian absurdity, presented by Luther and others, that all works, good and evil, in all men, good and evil, had to come about by necessity. . . . Such phrases are against the Word of God, harmful to all discipline, and blasphemous.<sup>6</sup>

Certainly by 1535,<sup>7</sup> Melanchthon was committed to synergism, insisting that "God does not work with man as a log, but draws him in such a way that his own will cooperates."<sup>8</sup> His position was this: "Grace precedes; the will follows. God draws; but he draws [only] the man who is willing."<sup>9</sup>

Concurrently, Melanchthon began to reconsider the Lord's Sup-

\*Read at the Spring meeting of the Society, Lancaster, Pa., April 23, 1954.

per. (Perhaps he did not fully and deeply grasp Luther's doctrine.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, he began to disagree and the *fact* of his disagreement is the important consideration.) In 1527, the Torgau discussions on the *Saxon Visitation Articles* involved Luther and Melanchthon in a moderate debate on the Supper.<sup>11</sup> Ubiquity may have been the issue because in the following year Melanchthon informed Balthasar<sup>12</sup> that Christ's body is not ubiquitous but, as a mystery, "is in the Church wherever the Church is." In 1529, he sent a thoughtful statement to Oecolampadius in criticism of the Swiss position, emphasizing that the Supper was a *communion* with the present Christ, not a commemoration of the absent Christ.<sup>13</sup> The weight of tradition and the horror of innovation bound him to Luther<sup>14</sup> and he was quite partisan at Marburg;<sup>15</sup> his open opposition to Bucer and the Swiss continued well into 1530.<sup>16</sup> To bring patristic support to Luther's doctrine, Melanchthon wrote the *Sententiae Patrum de Coena Domini* in March, 1530;<sup>17</sup> but Oecolampadius' *Dialogus* (1530) proved to be an overwhelming rebuttal. At last convinced that the Fathers did not support Luther, Melanchthon the steady traditionalist had no course except to break with Luther.<sup>18</sup> From the latter months of 1530 afterward, he became increasingly certain that the crux of the Supper was the communion of the person of Christ and the soul—a personal, efficacious, substantial indwelling of the God-Man in the believer.<sup>19</sup>

A growing understanding between Melanchthon and Bucer brought them to an agreement at Cassel in 1534<sup>20</sup> and anticipated an ultimate accord with the Swiss. Luther sensed the change in Melanchthon's doctrine before Cassel and was certain of it afterward.<sup>21</sup> He sent Melanchthon to Cassel with the formula: "The body is broken, eaten, and torn with the teeth."<sup>22</sup> "Don't ask me what my own view is," Melanchthon cautioned Camerarius; "for I am merely a messenger-boy for some friends."<sup>23</sup>

By 1534, Melanchthon's thought had reached maturity—an undeveloped version of the Reformed doctrine, in which the mode of Christ's presence was not explained, in which neither the necessity of faith nor the agency of the Holy Spirit were especially stressed, and in which the presence of Christ was promised "to those who eat" (*vescentibus*).<sup>24</sup> He was satisfied simply to proclaim the *fact* of Christ's presence with the bread, or better, in the Supper, attributing it to His will to be with men.<sup>25</sup>

*The Augustana Variata*<sup>26</sup> appeared in 1540—a revision of the *Augsburg Confession* undertaken by Melanchthon in 1536,<sup>27</sup> ostensibly to "make some things plainer."<sup>28</sup> Despite its modification of Art. X, on the Supper,<sup>29</sup> and its synergistic tendency, Luther failed to disavow it and orthodox Lutheranism did not challenge it until 1561. Under

the guise of being the improved edition, the *Variata* found its way into colloquys and diets,<sup>30</sup> into churches, homes, and schools,<sup>31</sup> and into the list of doctrinal norms cited by more than a few church orders.<sup>32</sup> The *Variata* gave Melanchthonianism confessional status. This is illustrated by the fact that, in signing the *Frankfort Recess* (1558), the evangelical princes professed belief "exclusively in the pure, true doctrine which is contained in the *Augsburg Confession*" and which they intended simply to "clarify" and "reiterate";<sup>33</sup> but actually, they signed a document which was in important places a collation of Melanchthon's writings.<sup>34</sup> Either the Melanchthonians were using the term "Augsburg Confession" so broadly as to cover their own doctrine or the princes had no real understanding of the original document. It is no wonder that the signers of the *Formula of Concord* declared in 1580: "It is no longer clear to us or to our theologians what is the confession once offered to the Emperor at Augsburg."<sup>35</sup>

Other writings by Melanchthon were influential—notably the editions of the *Loci Communes* after 1535, the *Saxon Confession* which he wrote in 1551 for presentation at Trent, and the catechetical work, *Examen Ordinandorum* (1554). Important, though controversial, spokesmen for Melanchthonianism were certain prominent professors in the universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg.<sup>36</sup> Of course, the effectiveness of Melanchthonianism is most clearly indicated by the reaction of the Gnesio-Lutherans, led by Flacius Illyricus. The very term Gnesio (genuine) Lutheran implies that Melanchthonianism was not genuine. Even more pointed was the label they attached to the Melanchthonians—Crypto (secret) Calvinists. Implicit in the Gnesio-Lutheran reaction was the fear that a second orthodoxy was developing in evangelical Germany.

In the twenty-first year of its existence, the *Variata* was finally challenged at the Colloquy of Naumburg, January-February, 1561. This meeting of the princes was prompted by rumors that the Palatinate, under Frederick III, was flirting with Calvinism. John Brenz, formerly a Melanchthonian but lately embittered, surmised that Calvinism was lurking in the *Variata*. Yet so positively did Electors Frederick of the Palatinate and Augustus of Saxony support the *Variata*,<sup>37</sup> that on February 1, the revised version was authorized as the current and correct interpretation of the original because (to quote the princes) "that clarified confession is to a much greater degree in use in our churches and schools."<sup>38</sup> The Naumburg Colloquy nevertheless foreshadowed the *Formula of Concord* (1580) which solved the same problem—the problem of two confessions and two orthodoxies—in precisely the opposite way. It repudiated the *Variata* and thereby

crushed the Melanchthonian tendency, giving cause for the extension of the Reformed Church in Germany.

This was the era during which the Palatinate matured in Protestantism.

## II

The Melanchthonian tendency entered the life of the churches in particular areas. And those areas can be determined by an examination of the evangelical *kirchenordnungen*. The important criteria are: a Melanchthonian doctrine of the Supper, a synergistic tendency, the citation of the *Variata* and/or other confessions and writings by Melanchthon, and the use of one of four or five liturgical prototypes.<sup>39</sup> The Palatinate became a part of the geographical pattern of Melanchthonianism. To the south, in the Swabian duchy of Württemberg, the tendency developed rather early under the leadership of John Brenz.<sup>40</sup> Thence it followed the Rhine northward into the Electoral Palatinate (1556)<sup>41</sup> and Pfalz-Zweibrücken (1557).<sup>42</sup> To the northeast, in Hesse, where the Reformed influence of Francis Lambert and Landgraf Philip persisted, it is difficult to date the transition; but at least the *erklärt* edition of the *Augsburg Confession* became an official symbol in the *Kirchenordnung* of 1566.<sup>43</sup> Between the Palatinate and Hesse lay Nassau, where the policy generally followed that of Hesse.<sup>44</sup> And the subsequent emergence of the German Reformed Church in both Hesse and Nassau was accomplished in co-operation with the Palatinate.<sup>45</sup> Mecklenburg, on the Baltic, used a Melanchthonian church order from 1552 to 1556; and from that document the Palatinate reproduced Melanchthon's *Examen Ordinandorum*.<sup>46</sup> Although Saxony was not directly influential it gave the Palatinate an ally in Elector Augustus, until his defection in 1574.<sup>47</sup> And, of course, Philip Melanchthon was a son of the Electorate and remained influential in Palatinate affairs until his death. The other centers of Melanchthonianism had no direct bearing upon Palatinate religion.

The first consistent Protestantism in the Palatinate was Melanchthonianism of the Württemberg or Brentian type, which Count Otto Henry introduced to Pfalz-Neuburg in 1554<sup>48</sup> and then, as Elector, to the electoral Palatinate in 1556. The *Kirchenordnung* of 1556<sup>49</sup> was practically a reproduction of the Greater Württemberg rite of 1553.<sup>50</sup> By its direction, churches at worship used the simple but liturgical services of Württemberg; ministers consulted the *Variata*; licentiates mastered Melanchthon's *Examen*; and children recited Brenz's *Landescatechismus* (1536).<sup>51</sup> At the same time, the churches were cleansed; exorcism forbidden; and the elevation of the cup prohibited.<sup>52</sup>

The tradition was strengthened in 1557, when Count Wolfgang

of Pfalz-Zweibrücken<sup>53</sup> introduced a *kirchenordnung*, composed by Melanchthon and Brenz from the Mecklenburg (1552) and Württemberg (1553) rites and incorporating Melanchthon's *Examen* and Brenz's *Landescatechismus*.<sup>54</sup> At the same time, acting upon Melanchthon's inspection and advice,<sup>55</sup> Elector Otto Henry began to recognize the University of Heidelberg. Tilemann Hesshus, a Gnesio-Lutheran zealot with a reputation for disturbance, was made President of the faculty and General Superintendent of churches. Michael Diller, a Melanchthonian, remained as court preacher. Peter Boquin, a Calvinist, was appointed to the theological faculty. And in the end, the Elector had assembled in Heidelberg quite an incongruous assortment of earnest theologians.<sup>56</sup>

Otto Henry and Wolfgang of Zweibrücken attended the Frankfort Diet and on March 18, 1558, signed the highly significant *Recess*,<sup>57</sup> upon which much of the later Palatinate religion would be justified. In the Elector's absence, there occurred the first clash between Superintendent Hesshus and a young Reformed deacon, William Klebitz. On the point of Reformed austerity, the latter denounced and the former defended a marble memorial to the childless Elector in the Church of the Holy Ghost, which depicted angels (dressed) and nymphs (undressed) dancing together. Otto Henry returned to a fully developed fight between the Gnesio Lutherans and the so-called Crypto-Calvinists. Death came providentially to the Elector on February 12, 1559.<sup>58</sup>

The eventful reign of Frederick III began in utmost confusion. Pulpits rang with intemperate strife. The land was filled with religious refugees, whom Otto Henry had invited.<sup>59</sup> Refugees and diversified theologians created a traffic in creeds. The matter became critical when Hesshus suppressed Brenz's *Catechism* in favor of Luther's. All parties twisted the *Augsburg Confession* to their purpose. The official doctrine of the Supper was, of course, that of Württemberg: "The body and blood of Christ are truly and presently distributed and eaten with the bread and wine."<sup>60</sup> Hesshus insisted upon the formula, "in, with, and under the bread." His ardent disciples added "'round and 'round" the bread. To the other extreme, Klebitz published seven *Theses on the Eucharist* (1559), in which he insisted upon the necessity of faith.<sup>61</sup>

While Frederick attended the Diet of Augsburg in the summer of 1559, Hesshus denounced Klebitz from the pulpit as a devil, an Arian heretic, and a sacramentarian; he tried to snatch the cup from Klebitz during Communion; he excommunicated him on September 6 and ordered him expelled.<sup>62</sup> Frederick returned to a great commotion. Diller failed to restore peace, using the words, "with the bread and

wine." In exasperation, Frederick dismissed Hesshus and Klebitz on September 16, then sent his secretary to secure Melanchthon's advice.

Melanchthon's *Responsio . . . ad questionem de controversia Heidelbergensi*,<sup>63</sup> dated November 1, 1559, said essentially three things: put aside all controversial formulas; stress the Pauline words, "The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ;" and explain "communion" in terms of

consociation with the body of Christ . . . a communion which is formed in the [actual] participation, a communion which cannot take place without the cognizance of it. . . . [Christ] is not present for the sake of the bread [but for the sake of the believers], as indeed he says, "Abide in me and I in you."

Frederick caused Melanchthon's *Responsio* to be published and on August 12, 1560, decreed that clergy must conform to it or vacate their pulpits.<sup>64</sup>

Meanwhile, John Brenz watched his grip on Palatinate affairs slip away and became aroused by rumors of Crypto-Calvinism. He had been alerted against the inroads of Calvinism since his discussions with John a Lasco in 1556, when a Lasco skillfully used the *Variata* to urge toleration for the exiled members of his London Strangers' Church.<sup>65</sup> On December 19, 1559, at the Synod of Stuttgart, Brenz led Württemberg back to Lutheranism; and a *Confession on the Real Presence* was adopted which taught absolute ubiquity and oral manducation.<sup>66</sup> The "decree of the Württemberg abbots" (as Melanchthon called the confession)<sup>67</sup> marked a dramatic turn of events, which did not escape notice. To rescue his father-in-law from "Calvinism," Duke John Frederick of Saxony arrived in Heidelberg in June, 1560, with his Gnesio-Lutheran experts, Mörlin and Stossel. In the public disputation which followed (June 5-7), Peter Boquin defended Calvin's doctrine of the Supper<sup>68</sup> so impressively that Frederick determined to invite other Reformed theologians to Heidelberg. Peter Martyr of Zurich and Wolfgang Musculus of Bern were called in 1560; both declined because of their years. But Peter Dathenus came from Frankfort and Caspar Olevianus from Trier. In 1561, Immanuel Tremellius and Zacharius Ursinus joined the faculty.<sup>69</sup> Late in 1560, the churches were more thoroughly cleansed. Altars were replaced by communion tables; wafers by domestic bread; and chalices by wooden cups. Observance of the Church Year was sharply curtailed.<sup>70</sup>

It is the accepted view that the disputation of June 1560, caused Frederick's "conversion to Calvinism."<sup>71</sup> The conclusion is superficial. The open profession of anything except Lutheranism or Roman Catholicism would have excluded Frederick automatically from the



*Peace of Augsburg*,<sup>72</sup> cost him his electoral authority, and brought persecution upon his people. That was simply out of the question. Moreover, the Elector denied such a conversion and disclaimed knowledge of any "ism."<sup>73</sup> He affirmed the *Variata* for thirteen years after the publication of the *Heidelberg Catechism*—in fact, to his very death.<sup>74</sup> He believed that the Bible and the *Variata* fully justified the Reformed elements being taught in the Palatinate.<sup>75</sup> And these things he did sincerely, though perhaps naively.

The *Variata* was precisely the problem which brought the evangelical princes to Naumburg in 1561. Although Frederick vigorously defended the unique authority of the *Variata*,<sup>76</sup> the compromise introduced by Augustus of Saxony prevailed. The *Invariata* (1530) was confessed as the point of evangelical unity; and the *Variata* was acknowledged to be the current and correct interpretation.<sup>77</sup> Three Gnesio-Lutheran spokesmen decidedly opposed this decision—Brenz in Württemberg, Hesshus now in charge in Zweibrücken, and Duke John Frederick of Saxony.<sup>78</sup> The pressure from this cabal had to be met; and the public distraction composed. The *Augsburg Confession*, at the center of the strife, was no longer effective. In 1562, Frederick commissioned a new catechism and liturgy. The *Palatinate Church Order* of 1563 was undertaken.

### III

Immediately following the publication of the *kirchenordnung*, Frederick declared: "We are not conscious of the slightest defection from the previous doctrine. . . ."<sup>79</sup> Yet, Olevianus confessed to Bullinger that the *Heidelberg Catechism* consisted "not of one but of many" sources;<sup>80</sup> and with the exception of Melanchthon's *Examen* and Brenz's *Catechism*, these were all Reformed sources, worked together by a commission in which Reformed theologians were predominant. According to the Preface, "the entire theological faculty and all the Superintendents and the most prominent ministers" collaborated,<sup>81</sup> basing their work upon the Larger and Smaller Catechisms of Zacharius Ursinus.

Ursinus was twenty-seven when he arrived in 1561. From 1550 to 1557, he had shared Melanchthon's home as well as his learning. The impression upon him was great: "When Philip has spoken, I cannot and dare not think otherwise."<sup>82</sup> Bearing Melanchthon's recommendation, he had toured the centers of Reformed learning in 1557 and especially gained the confidence of Peter Martyr. Yet, as late as 1558, in his inaugural address in Breslau he pointedly commended "the correct and simple language" of Melanchthon's *Examen*,<sup>83</sup> which he used as the basis of his teaching. In his *Theses on the Eucharist*

(1560),<sup>84</sup> Ursinus placed Christ's body in heaven (upon which point Melanchthon was silent) and wrote rather easily of election (to which three years before he referred as "Stoic Necessity"). And when, in 1560, the Gnesio-Lutherans drove him from Breslau, Melanchthon was dead and Ursinus exclaimed: "If my teacher Melanchthon were still alive, I would not go anywhere except to him. But since he is dead, I will go to Zurich where there are pious, great, and learned men."<sup>85</sup> It was to Zurich, then, by default. Once again with Martyr, Ursinus had a definite change of opinion. Writing to a patron on October 6, 1560—three days after arrival—he confessed that he had accepted the Swiss position in every particular—*de Sacramentis, de Providentia et Electione Dei, de libero arbitrio, de Traditionibus humanis in Ecclesia, de disciplinae christianae servitate*.<sup>86</sup> Hence, the Ursinus who came to Heidelberg was a young man, unsettled in his thought, his doctrinal predilection divided between Wittenberg and Zurich. Perhaps the Mercersburg theologians overestimated his appreciation for Melanchthon. In any case, Melanchthonianism in the Palatinate was older, more positive, and more pervasive.

Within his first three years in Heidelberg (1561-63), Ursinus labored upon three catechisms.<sup>87</sup> The Larger pivots upon Peter Martyr's doctrine of the covenant; the Smaller abandons the covenant matrix and emphasizes "comfort" in the context of election; and the Heidelberg makes "comfort" the controlling idea. In these three, one source becomes increasingly important until, in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, it outweighs the influence of all other sources—the Calvinism taught by John a Lasco.

As Superintendent of the Strangers' Church in London, a Lasco published a *kirchenordnung* in 1550—*Forma ac Ratio*<sup>88</sup>—of which the catechetical and liturgical portions were formative sources of the *Heidelberg Catechism* and the Palatinate liturgy. There were three editions of a Lasco's basic catechetical work, the *Emden Catechism* of 1546.<sup>89</sup> One of them, an abridgement by Micronius, was published in *Forma ac Ratio*. And all of them were consulted by the makers of the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

"Comfort" was the important word in a Lasco's catechisms. God's omnipotence is a comfort;<sup>90</sup> his fatherhood is a comfort.<sup>91</sup> "Faith in the only Mediator and Savior" is the sole comfort of the condemned man.<sup>92</sup> The latter articles of the creed (remission of sins, resurrection and eternal life) are comforts.<sup>93</sup> The Lord's Supper is a comfort.<sup>94</sup> It is a comfort to recognize oneself a member of "the continuing church or congregation of the elect."<sup>95</sup> Indeed, a Lasco taught election but prominently as a source of assurance. He seems to have rejected a

limited atonement<sup>96</sup> and frankly stated that Calvin had written "too harshly" on predestination.<sup>97</sup>

But how did a Lasco's teachings enter Palatinate life? The ways were many. Beginning in 1545, a Lasco had exerted an important influence on Otto Henry.<sup>98</sup> He visited Melanchthon in Wittenberg in 1556, when Ursinus was living in Melanchthon's home.<sup>99</sup> His refugee congregation, having been driven from England during the Marian perescution, settled near Heidelberg in 1562, carrying with them a Lasco's catechisms and liturgy. Both Ursinus and Olevianus were in communication with these people.<sup>100</sup> Finally, Peter Dathenus and Immanuel Tremellius had been associated with a Lasco in London prior to their service in the Palatinate.

Of 129 questions in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, considerably more than half were taken from existing catechetical works.<sup>101</sup> Of that number, 35 at very least must be attributed to a Lasco's catechisms. Perhaps ten can be traced directly to Calvin; five to Brenz's *Landescatechismus*.<sup>102</sup> More significant, the catechisms of a Lasco contributed the formative questions—on comfort (1, 21, 26, 31, 53, 54), faith (21), atonement (37), church (54), Creed, Commandments and Lord's Prayer. And the four questions which teach election as a source of comfort (1, 31, 53, 54) were all taken from a Lasco's works. There are no other explicit references to election in the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

John W. Nevin insisted that the *Heidelberg Catechism* had a "Melanchthonian cadence."<sup>103</sup> The history of Palatinate religion before 1563 makes that contention entirely probable. And much in the nature of the document supports it. Nevin pointed especially to its catholicity and a mystical spirit which overcame the "cold workmanship . . . of the rationalizing intellect." There are other signs. The structure is essentially that of Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, and typically Lutheran—Man's Misery in Sin; Man's Deliverance through Christ; Man's Thankfulness for Deliverance by His Doing Good Works. The idea of relating "thankfulness" and "good works" was a feature of Brenz's *Landescatechismus*.<sup>104</sup> Again, the *Heidelberg Catechism* is Christocentric. The one offering of Christ on the cross is the ultimate source of man's comfort. Yet the particular relationship between "comfort" and "forgiveness through Christ," which is enunciated in the first question, was taken from a Lasco's catechisms and in some sentences literally so.<sup>105</sup> Again, the speculative element of reprobation is not discussed and the doctrine of election is made subservient to the controlling idea of comfort. The result is a piety which does not center in glory and obedience to God, but in trust, assurance, strength. God "gathers" and "defends;" God "preserves," "assures," "abides;" He is inseparable; Christ's sacrifice is efficacious "not only to others

but also to me." The atonement is not limited to the elect (37); but only those participate who are "ingrafted into Christ and receive all his benefits" (20). The condition is faith—"a certain knowledge" and "a hearty trust" (21) in the "sacrifice of Jesus Christ . . . as the only ground of our salvation," which "the Holy Ghost teaches us in the Gospel and confirms to us by the Holy Sacraments" (67).

The doctrine of the Supper is Calvinistic. To communicate

is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ . . . but also to become more and more united to his sacred body by the Holy Ghost who dwells both in Christ and in us; so that, though Christ is in heaven and we are on earth, we are nevertheless flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone . . . (76).

The grammatical technique, "not only . . . but also," appears in two other questions on the Supper (75, 79) with the apparent purpose of transcending a memorial view, possibly also a Lasco's emphasis upon oblation.<sup>106</sup> For the same purpose perhaps, Brenz's word *Wahrzeichen* is employed—"true signs," signs which carry the reality.<sup>107</sup> Both Frederick and Ursinus subsequently defended this doctrine in writing as being in conformity to the *Variata*.<sup>108</sup>

That the Palatinate became Reformed by the *Heidelberg Catechism* is true. But the whole truth must take into account the Melancthonian preparation, the character of a Lasco's Calvinism, the mediating spirit of the *Catechism* and both the compulsion and the apparent desire to defend it as being faithful to the *Variata*.

The *Church Order* of 1563 also contained the Palatinate liturgy. Of many rites which Olevianus<sup>109</sup> and his commission consulted, three were especially helpful—the Greater Würtemberg (1553), the Genevan (1542, and Frankfort, 1554), and a Lasco's London liturgy (1550) which was itself in the Genevan tradition. The Baptismal office is largely Genevan.<sup>110</sup> The Communion liturgy is patterned after a Lasco's service, though many of the prayers and the first part of the exhortation, through the fencing of the table, are Genevan.<sup>111</sup> The communion confession, spoken in the first person, is from Würtemberg; the absolution, pronounced by the celebrant in the first person, is comparable to that of Cologne (1543).<sup>112</sup> The Catechetical office, which stresses catechetical preaching, and the Preparatory office are both similar to those of Würtemberg.

The Palatinate cultus became Reformed in 1563—in terminology and physical appointments, in liturgical policy and spirit, and by virtue of its formative sources. Yet, again it is clear that the Palatinate did not wholly dismiss its Melancthonian heritage; but in this case that heritage was the Würtemberg liturgical tradition, marked by a simplicity such as not to make the transition difficult.

## IV

Frederick's opponents were prompt to attack the *Church Order*. Son-in-law John Frederick of Saxony turned his wife against her father.<sup>114</sup> Emperor Maximilian, having found the *Catechism* to be "Zwinglian," threatened exclusion from the *Peace of Augsburg*.<sup>115</sup> The princes of Württemberg, Zweibrücken, and Baden charged "that the Zwinglianism and Calvinism in the articles on the Lord's Supper are a seductive and damned error."<sup>116</sup> Frederick replied calmly (September 14, 1563): "There has been no defection. . . . We acknowledge and embrace the same divine Word, the [*Augsburg*] *Confession* derived from it, the *Apology*, and the *Frankfort Recess*." He emphasized that "the Lord Christ himself, *ganz und gar* . . . is communicated to us" in the Supper."<sup>117</sup>

At the colloquy of Maulbron, April, 1564, the issue turned on ubiquity; and in a classic statement of Reformed theology, Ursinus opposed the Württemberg divines.<sup>118</sup> But, as Frederick feared, the "restless theologians" increased the tension. Thereafter, Christopher of Württemberg and Wolfgang of Zweibrücken began a systematic effort to exclude the Palatinate from the *Peace of Augsburg*. In January, 1566, Frederick received the announcement and agenda for an Imperial Diet, scheduled for Augsburg in March. The second item on the agenda promised a discussion of the "destructive and corrupting sects."<sup>119</sup> The subtle threat was not lost upon Frederick. Upon arrival in Augsburg, he discovered that he was already being regarded as an apostate. In defense, he declared: "We still abide by the . . . *Augsburg Confession* and its *Apology* and the *Frankfort Recess*. [This is the doctrine] we still profess and command to be regularly preached and taught in our churches and schools."<sup>120</sup> On May 14, before the Diet, the Elector was charged with gross innovations and ordered to recant on penalty of being deposed. He replied:<sup>121</sup>

What men understand by Calvinism, I don't know. I can say with a clean conscience that I have never read Calvin's writings. As to the agreement made at Frankfort [i.e., the *Recess*] and to the *Augsburg Confession* that I signed at Augsburg with the other princes—the majority of whom are present today—in this faith I continue firmly. . . . And I do not believe that anyone can successfully show that I have done or accepted anything that stands opposed to that *Confession*. . . .

In its entirety, it was a moving appeal. Said Augustus of Saxony: *Fritz, du bist frömmere denn wir alle*. But the attack was renewed on May 23, with emphasis on the Lord's Supper. Again Frederick affirmed the *Augsburg Confession* disclaiming knowledge of other doctrines.

According to rumor, Bullinger was the author of the *Heidelberg Catechism*. Indeed, Frederick had written to Zurich in 1565, in request

of a statement to support his *Catechism*.<sup>123</sup> In reply, he had received the *Second Helvetic Confession* (1562) but did not use it. Writing from Amberg, November 1, 1566, Frederick spiked with enthusiasm the rumor of alliance with the Swiss: "The report that I have had my *Catechism* and *Kirchenordnung* prepared in Zurich by Bullinger and his associates is an open and barefaced lie."<sup>124</sup> The theory popularized by opponents of Mercersburg Theology, that the German Reformed Church was organically related to the Swiss Reformation seems, at this writing, to have been overdrawn.

In a flurry of polemical tracts, theologians busily attacked the *Catechism*.<sup>125</sup> Ursinus responded, frequently appealing to the *Augsburg Confession*. In one such reply, Melanchthon's *Responsio* was an appendix.<sup>126</sup> In fact, instead of suppressing the Melanchthonian heritage, the Heidelberg authorities precisely kept it in the public mind. In 1566, for instance, an important catechetical aid was published, entitled *The Teaching of the Augsburg Confession, its Apology, and Repetition, and the Frankfort Recess on the Sacraments*.<sup>127</sup> In his *Christliche Confession*, written the year of his death (1576), Frederick subscribed exclusively to the *Augsburg Confession* of 1530, demanding only the freedom of interpretation.<sup>128</sup>

Intention is an important consideration. Clearly the intention of Frederick III and his theologians was not to repudiate the German Reformation but to oppose the dogmatic orthodoxy of Gnesio-Lutheranism in favor of an evangelical consciousness, previously Melanchthonian, henceforth by necessity Reformed. And this was the very intention of those other Melanchthonian churches which were displaced by the *Formula of Concord* and became German Reformed. The *Nassau Confession* (1578) is illustrative:<sup>129</sup>

After the separation from the papacy took place, two doctrines . . . appeared, namely, the Augsburg—the first and oldest in the German Reich—and then, a few years afterward, the doctrine of the other reformed churches outside Germany. . . . The Christian authority of this Count and county, which has previously embraced the true Augsburg doctrine in its correct interpretation, has given permission to bring together and consider diligently both of these doctrines. . . . Since Philip Melanchthon, as a distinguished teacher of the Augsburg doctrine, maintained a firm Christian unity and love with the teachers of the other reformed churches, . . . there should exist between these traditions . . . a more beautiful and lovely harmony. . . . The *Augsburg Confession* was not written to contradict the doctrine of the other reformed churches but only popish errors. . . . And the reformed churches attest . . . in public writings that they, in accord with the *Augsburg Confession*, submit to the same Word of God and understand [it] according to the intrinsic interpretation . . . which is explicitly established in the *Repetition* and other writings. . . .

The appeal to Melanchthon as "the distinguished teacher of Augsburg doctrine," the attempt to discredit Gnesio-Lutheranism by describing



Melanchthonianism as "the first and oldest" doctrine, and the declaration of unity with the Reformed churches on the basis of the *Variata*—these marked the sentiment of the German Reformed Church in the sixteenth century. With the exception of the *Bremen Consensus* (1595), the German Reformed confessions seem wholly to share the spirit of the *Palatinate Church Order*. In Nassau, for instance, the doctrine of the Supper remained that of the *Frankfort Recess*.<sup>130</sup> The *Hessian Catechism* (1607) decried the "hard [predestinarian] terms employed by others."<sup>131</sup> And the cultus was everywhere similar. The *Variata*, that last bond with the German Reformation, was affirmed in every important center—Hesse, Nassau, Bremen, and Brandenburg.<sup>132</sup> As late as 1614, in his *Private Confession* which marked the beginning of the Reformed Church in Brandenburg, Elector John Sigismund affirmed only one symbol—"the *Augsburg Confession* which was presented to Emperor Charles V . . . in 1530 and afterward significantly studied and improved."<sup>133</sup>

I have been concerned simply to illustrate the result of Gnesio-Lutheran pressure upon the Melanchthonian churches and to suggest that the sensitive approach to the history of the German Reformed Church in the sixteenth century is to regard it, at least in part, as the succession of Melanchthonianism.

1. Wilhelm Niesel (ed.) *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der . . . Reformierten Kirche* (Zurich, 1938), pp. 136-218.
2. August Ebrard used the term. See "Melanchthon and the Melanchthonian Tendency," *Tercentenary Monument . . . of the Heidelberg Catechism* (Chambersburg, 1863), pp. 89-112.
3. Melanchthon's independence began during the Wittenberg disorders (1521-22). Repulsed by the "ignorance" and "bad manners" of his associates, he retreated to the fringe of the Church and assumed the humanist's role of educator. See *Melanchthons Opera: Corpus Reformatorum*, I, 514, 613, 576; II, 514.
4. *Melanchthons Opera: Corpus Reformatorum*, I, 673, 675.
5. *Ibid.*, I, 637.
6. *Ibid.*, IX, 766: *Opinion* of 1558.
7. *Ibid.*, XXI, 271-74: the *Loci Communes* of 1535.
8. H. E. Jacobs (ed.) *Book of Concord* (Phila., 1893), I, 262: the *Leipzig Interim*.
9. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IX, 768: *Opinion* of 1558.
10. A charge frequently made against Melanchthon. For Luther's doctrine, see E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* (St. Louis, 1950), pp. 701-03.

Both parties to the Crypto-Calvinist Controversy may have misunderstood Luther. Granted this possibility, the controversy was nonetheless real; its results nonetheless significant.

11. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, I, 913: Melanchthon to Jonas.
12. *Ibid.*, I, 948f.
13. Robert Stupperich (ed.) *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* (Gütersloh, 1951), I, 297-300.
14. See: *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, I, 1106; 974; II, 25. See: H. E. Bindseil, *Philippi Melanchthonis Epistolae, Iudicia, Consilia, Testimonia* (Halle, 1874), p. 40.
15. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, I, 1070 (to Baumgartner); I, 1068 (to Camerarius); I, 1108 (to Agriola); I, 1067 (to the Elector); I, 1078, 1080.
16. *Ibid.*, II, 25, 193. Bucer was attacked in his *Opinion Concerning the Foundation of the Doctrine of the Sacramentarians*; Jacobs, *Book of Concord*, II, 241-43.
17. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, XXIII, 733-52.
18. *Ibid.*, II, 217 (to Luther); II, 822, 824 (to Camerarius and Brenz, Jan., 1535).
19. *Ibid.*, II, 620 (to Rothmann, Dec., 1532). See: *Centuria Epistolarum ad*

- Schwebelium*, pp. 150f. (Bucer to Schwebel, Nov. 9, 1530).
20. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, II, 498 (to Bucer, Apr., 1531); II, 822 (the Cassel agreement).
  21. *Ibid.*, III, 427. Chancellor Brück to the Elector: "Luther seemed to be provoked because . . . it seemed as if Melancthon had almost gone Zwinglian since his return from Cassel." See: W. M. L. de Wette (ed.) *Luthers Briefe* (Berlin, 1825-56), IV, 569.
  22. De Wette, *Luthers Briefe*, IV, 572.
  23. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, II, 822.
  24. H. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Cassel, 1855), p. 346 (The *Variata*, Art. X). *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, XXI, 863 (The *Loci Communes* of 1559).
  25. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IX, 960f. (*Responsio*, 1559).
  26. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, pp. 340ff.
  27. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, II, 861, 871. Melancthon informed Myconius in 1536 that he was making the *Confession* "almost entirely new." On May 5, 1537, Elector John Frederick complained "that M. Philip undertook in several places to alter, soften, and publish" the *Confession* (*Ibid.*, III, 366). Peucer knew of a draft in 1538 (*Ibid.*, XXVI, 342).
  28. *Ibid.*, IV, 37, 37.
  29. *Cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi, vescentibus in Coena Domini*.
  30. Diet of Worms, 1541: *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IV, 34, 37. At Regensburg, 1541, Calvin subscribed: *Calvin Opera*, V (*C.R.*, XXXIII), 509f. The *Variata* was used in all imperial diets through 1561.
  31. So states the Naumburg agreement (1561): Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprot. Kirche*, pp. 583ff.
  32. E.g., the *Hessian Kirchenordnung* (1566), the *Pomeranian Synodal Statutes* (1574), the *Nassau Confession* (1578), the *Anhalt Repetition* (1581), the *Private Confession* (1614) of John Sigismund of Brandenburg. More often the *Invariata* was modified by Melancthon's *Loci* or *Examen*, by the *Saxon Confession* or the *Frankfort Recess* (1558).
  33. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, p. 563.
  34. E.g., the article on the Supper agrees verbally with the *Variata*, *Examen*, and *Loci* (1535). See: Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, pp. 568-70.
  35. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche* (Göttingen, 1952), p. 746.
  36. Notably Bugenhagen, Camerarius, Major, Eber. Heppe has written four vols. on this period: *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581* (Marburg, 1852-58).
  37. A. Kluckhohn (ed.) *Briefe Friedrich des Frommen Kurfürsten von der Pfalz* (Brunswick, 1559-76), I, 158ff.
  38. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, p. 591.
  39. The liturgical traditions of Pomerania, Hesse, Cologne (*Pia Deliberatio*, 1543), Mecklenburg and Würtemberg. See: A. L. Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1871).
  40. Both the *Gemeinkirchenordnung* (1563) and Brenz's *Landes catechismus* (1536) teach a Melancthonian doctrine of the Supper. See: Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, I, 207, 268; see: Karl Buchrucker, *Die Normalkatechismen der christlichen Kirchen* (Nürnberg, 1890), pp. 1-8.
  41. By the church order of that year. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 177f.
  42. By the church order of that year. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 146.
  43. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 295.
  44. For example, the *Kirchenordnung und Reformation* (1576) and the *Agenda* were reproductions of the *Hessian Reformation* (1573) and *Agenda* (1574). Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 400; II, 348ff., 393ff.
  45. As one example, the *Nassau Confession* (1578) cites the *Obrigkeit dieses Orths—negst den pfälzischen Kirchen, in etlichen Stücken, von den benachbarten Hessischen Kirchen*. See: Heinrich Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirchen Deutschlands* (Elberfeld, 1860), pp. 140f.
  46. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, XXIII, 1-103; Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 116.
  47. See: Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, II, 468ff. The *Kirchenordnung* of 1580 affirmed the *ungeenderten Augsburgischen Confession*. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 402.
  48. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 146f.
  49. *Ibid.*, II, 177ff.
  50. *Ibid.*, II, 131ff.
  51. Buchrucker, *Die Normalkatechismen*, pp. 1-8.
  52. Burcard Struve, *Ausführlicher Bericht von der Pfälzischen Kirchen-Historie* (Frankfort, 1721), p. 52.
  53. In addition to the main Electoral line, there were collateral branches of the family, which ruled the smaller portions of the Palatinate as Counts Palatine. These lands were known by the names of their chief cities: Amberg, Neuburg, Zweibrücken, and Simmern. Zweibrücken was directly west of the electoral Palatinate.
  54. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 194ff.

- See: *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, VIII, 806, 937.
55. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IX, 341, 343.
  56. Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 29ff.
  57. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, p. 597.
  58. Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 66ff.
  59. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IX, 144, 146: to Brenz and Camerarius expressing concern over Palatinate affairs.
  60. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 137. See: Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 48.
  61. Text: Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 78.
  62. Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 82.
  63. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IX, 960f.
  64. By the *Kirchen-Raths Ordnung* (1560).
  65. A. Kuyper (ed.) *Joannis a Lasco Opera* (Amsterdam, 1866), II, 724-30.
  66. Heinrich Heppe, *Die Entstehung und Fortbildung des Lutherthums und die kirchlichen Bekenntnis-Schriften desselben von 1548-1576* (Cassel, 1863), pp. 60ff.
  67. *Melanchthons Opera: C.R.*, IX, 1036.
  68. Using Klebitz's *Theses* (1559). Texts: Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 78, 98.
  69. Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 104-111, *passim*.
  70. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
  71. So: Altling, Struve, Sudhoff, Seisen and others. See: James I. Good, *The Heidelberg Catechism in Its Newest Light* (Phila., 1914), p. 135.
  72. Religious other than Roman Catholic and Lutheran "shall not be included in the present peace but shall be to totally excluded from it." See: B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford, 1911), p. 364.
  73. Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 661-664.
  74. See Frederick's *Christliche Confession* (1577): Heppe: *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirchen*, p. 3.
  75. Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 661-664.
  76. *Ibid.*, I, 158f.
  77. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, p. 591.
  78. See: Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 391, 416, 439, 440, 466.
  79. *Ibid.*, I, 450.
  80. Karl Sudhoff, *C. Olevianus und Z. Ursinus: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld, 1857), p. 483: letter of Apr. 14, 1563.
  81. Niesel, *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen*, p. 139.
  82. Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, p. 457.
  83. *Corpus doctrinae orthodoxae sive catecheticarum explicationum . . . opus absolutum D. Davidis Parei* (Heidelberg, 1612), p. 1006. The address was entitled: *Oratio exhortatoria ad doctrinae christianae studium*.
  84. *Ursini Opera* (ed., Quinius Reuter), I, 755-803.
  85. Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, p. 487 (text).
  86. *Ibid.*, p. 9: text of letter to Crato of Craffheim.
  87. *Ursini Opera* (ed., Reuter), II.
  88. Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, II, 1-277. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 99f.
  89. *Emden Catechism* (1546)—250 questions. Miconius' abridgement in *Forma ac Ratio* (1550)—45 questions; Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, II, 127-135. Utenhoven's Flemish translation (1551)—250 questions; *Ibid.*, II, 341-475. Miconius' second abridgement, for the churches of East Friesland (1554)—94 questions; *Ibid.*, II, 500-543; and Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirchen*, pp. 295-310.
  90. Utenhoven edition, No. 124.
  91. Utenhoven edition, No. 125.
  92. Miconius edition (1554), No. 24.
  93. Miconius edition (1550), No. 24.
  94. Miconius edition (1550), No. 37.
  95. Miconius edition (1550), No. 27; Utenhoven edition, No. 169; Miconius edition (1554), No. 45.
  96. Miconius edition (1554), No. 82. See: Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, I, 503: *Epitome of Doctrine* (1544).
  97. Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, II, 676: to Bullinger, June 6, 1553.
  98. *Ibid.*, II, 716f., 718. See: Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 65.
  99. Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, II, 733.
  100. *Ursini Opera* (ed., Reuter), I, 8.
  101. The following research is independent of, and often at variance with A. Lang, *Der Heidelberger Katechismus und vier verwandte Katechismen: Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus*. Jahrgang 1907, Heft 3.
  102. To a Lasco: 1, 21, 22, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 53, 54, 56, 66, 68, 69, 74, 81, 82, 92-113, 108, 119-124. To Calvin: 27, 45, 46, 47, 49, 70, 109, 110; Lang adds 30, 32, 48, 88, 108. To Brenz: 59, 60-64, 66, 83, 115 and the relationship between "thanks" and "works" on which Part III is based.
  103. "Zacharius Ursinus," *Mercersburg Review* Vol. III (Sept., 1851), pp. 490-512.
  104. Buchrucker, *Die Normelkatechismen*, p. 6.
  105. See: Miconius edition, 1554, No. 2, 3 (Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, II, 451) and Miconius edition, 1550, No. 1 (*Opera*, II, 127).
  106. See: Kuyper, *a Lasco Opera*, I, 571 (*Epistola Amicum*); I, 465ff. (*Summa Controv. de Coena*)
  107. Questions 73, 76, 79. See: Buchrucker, *Die Normelkatechismen*, p. 4.
  108. See: Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 454 (Frederick's *Defense* of Sept. 14, 1563); A. Ebrard, *Dogma von heiligen Abendmahl und seine Geschichte* (Frankfort,

- 1846), II, 618-634 (Ursinus' *Gründlicher Bericht vom heiligen Abendmahl*, 1564); and H. Heppe, *Die confessionelle Entwicklung der altprotestantischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Marburg, 1854), pp. 405-25 (the *Heidelberg Repetition*, 1566).
109. Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, pp. 483-85; Olevianus to Bullinger, Oct. 25, 1563.
  110. See: *Corpus Reformatorum* (Calvin), VI, 185.
  111. Compare: Pollanus' *Liturgia Sacra* (1554). Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 150ff.
  112. Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, II, 136 (Württemberg); II, 42 (Cologne).
  113. *Ibid.*, II, 134f.
  114. Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 390, 416, 440.
  115. *Ibid.*, I, 398.
  116. *Ibid.*, I, 399.
  117. *Ibid.*, I, 449-460, especially p. 450 and p. 454.
  118. *Ibid.*, I, 504-505 (reconstruction).
  119. See: Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 625f.
  120. *Ibid.*, I, 652f.
  121. *Ibid.*, I, 661-664; Struve, *Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 187-190.
  122. Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 681ff.
  123. *Ibid.*, II/2, 1039-1040: to Bullinger, May 19, 1566. Frederick also had some correspondence with Calvin: *Ibid.*, II/2, 1037f.
  124. *Ibid.*, I, 726.
  125. Brenz's *Verzeichniss der Mängel* (1565); Hesshus' *True Warning* (1564); the *Censures* of Brenz and Andreae (1564). See: Kluckhohn, *Briefe*, I, 399.
  126. Ursinus' *Gründlicher Bericht vom heiligen Abendmahl . . . aus enhelliger Lehre, der heiligen Schrift, der alten rechtgläubigen christlichen Kirchen, und auch der Augspurgischen Confession* (1564). Text: Ebrard, *Dogma von heiligen Abendmahl*, II, 618-634.
  127. Text: Heppe, *Die confessionelle Entwicklung der altprotestantischen Kirche Deutschlands*, pp. 405-25.
  128. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirchen*, pp. 3f.
  129. *Ibid.*, p. xii, pp. 70f.
  130. Compare: the *Nassau Confession* (Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirchen*, p. 80) and the *Frankfort Recess* (Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der altprotestantischen Kirche*, p. 570).
  131. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirchen*, p. 247.
  132. *Ibid.*, p. 249 (*Hessian Catechism*, 1607); p. 71 (*Nassau Confession*, 1578); pp. 148f. (*Bremen Consensus*, 1595); p. 286 (Sigismund of Brandenburg: *Private Confession*, 1614).
  133. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

## DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN CHURCH HISTORY

(*Church History* is concerned that a wider use be made of the dissertations relevant to its field submitted for the doctor's degree in graduate schools. In this issue we begin the publication of abstracts composed by the authors of theses accepted since 1949. The editors will welcome proposals of further dissertations from schools or authors.)

"The Pre-History of the Form of the Church" by N. Frederick Lang, (583 Lowell St., Westbury, L.I., N.Y.) Harvard University, 1952. Director: Professor George H. Williams.

The author first surveys and contrasts first-century Graeco-Latin and Egyptian public organization and compares them with Jewish public organization in Judaea and in the communities of the western Diaspora, and then studies the relationships between these Jewish public organizations and the synagogues and the Pharisaic party. The method is largely philological. Materials used include, besides the conventional literary sources (Jewish, Latin and Greek sacred and profane authors), archeological, epigraphic and numismatic sources, and, especially, the Talmudic materials. The work of numerous scholars since Schürer is taken into account.

The primitive, kin-group character of the Latin and Greek "cities" is emphasized. The Egyptians, by contrast, had lost all trace of kin-groups long since, and sovereignty resided in the god-king, the proprietor of the land, whose tenants the inhabitants were.

Judaea had the appearance of Egypt; its inhabitants were, therefore, "Jews," i.e. "Judaeans." In their own thinking, however, they were "Israelites," a "people," a kin-group. Each Latin and Greek "people" coincided with a single "city." Israel, however, comprehended many "cities"; its elders, therefore, instead of forming a single senate, functioned, collegially, at two levels, local and "national." All this was laid down in the Law, under

which to live was the touchstone of the Israelite. In the Gentile cities of the western Diaspora, the Israelites were organized into aloof communes, quasi-cities, with their own "city-elders" to administer the Law in their communal life.

A by-product of the administration of the Law by the Israelite elders was the Sabbath-assembly for the reading and interpretation of the Law. This so-called "synagogue liturgy" might be done anywhere ("privately"). The elders, as such, were not directly involved in it. Furthermore, there is no evidence that elements of worship were introduced into it until well after the destruction of the second Temple (70 A.D.). The worship of God was still restricted, so far as "public" acts were concerned, to the Temple and the priesthood.

The other institution of major importance to the early organization of the Christian Church was the "order" of the Pharisees. It consisted, organizationally, of cellular units of two sorts: first, a small number of "houses" of individual "sages" (or "rabbis") and their "disciples" (inspired ultimately by the Hellenistic sophist and his disciples), and, second, of a large number of "fellowships" or "clubs" (*chabhuroth*; cf. the various sorts of Hellenistic *koina*), whose members were all on a par. The focus of both types was the fellowship-meal, ultimately traceable to the Hellenistic *symposion*. A sort of liturgy grew up around the meal. It seems extremely probable that the earliest elements of worship in the synagogue-liturgy were grafts upon it, well after 70 A.D., of portions of the private, Pharisaic liturgy.

"The Use of the Septuagint in the *Five Books against Heresies* by Irenaeus of Lyons" by Alfred B. Starratt. (Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.) Harvard, 1952. Director: Professor Henry J. Cadbury.

The publication of the five books against heresies occurred at the time when the New Testament was on the threshold of acceptance as sacred scripture. We have in this work, therefore, one of the last representatives of the earlier Biblical exegesis which found in the Old Testament all that was needed to justify Christian doctrine and practice.

The evidence brought forward in this dissertation tends to confirm the theory that the earliest literary activity in the Christian Church was the collection of texts for use in supporting distinctive Christian doctrines against the contrary opinions of the Jews. Irenaeus claims to have in his possession four such books that were edited by the Apostles Peter, John, Matthew and Paul. Previous students of Irenaeus have mistakenly supposed that the author of *Adversus Haereses* was referring to writings now included in our New Testament when he makes this claim, but more careful study indicates a greater probability that his reference is to Testimony Books. The dissertation also shows that Irenaeus and his predecessors used such collections in their exegetical labors far more than they used the complete Old Testament books.

Other interesting conclusions of the study may be briefly summarized as follows: (1) Irenaeus believed that every word of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament was dictated by God; that the version is one consistent unit; and that its sole function is to reveal divine truth. (2) The actual principles of exegesis used by Irenaeus, as revealed by his practice, show the same methodological errors throughout which he complains of in the works of the Gnostics. (3) Neither Irenaeus nor his opponents use Scripture as a means of discovering correct doctrine,

but rather as a means of defending pre-conceived ideas. (4) Irenaeus is a representative of an exegetical tradition rather than an original worker in the field. (5) Isaiah, Psalms, and Genesis, in that order, are the books most used by Irenaeus. He uses them throughout as vehicles of revelation, and nowhere refers to the value of interesting narratives or to the intrinsic religious and moral value of Scriptural passages. Three hundred and five out of a total of three hundred and twenty-four direct quotations of the Old Testament given by Irenaeus are drawn from passages in which the text records direct speech attributed by the Scripture to God, the prophets, or one of the characters in the Old Testament narratives. Such selectivity results from almost exclusive concern with the revealing words of God spoken directly or indirectly in the sacred books.

The dissertation shows that superficial study of Irenaeus in times past has resulted in praise of his exegetical methods which is entirely unwarranted.

"John Calvin's Concept of Faith, Presented on the Basis of the *Institutes* and the Commentaries, the Catechisms, the Confessions and the Theological Treatises" by Walter E. Stuermann. (University of Tulsa.) Chicago, 1950. Director: Professor Wilhelm Pauck.

This is a study of Calvin's concept of faith, based upon the *Institutes*, the commentaries, the catechisms, the confessions, and the theological writings. It does not make use of the Reformer's sermons. Numerous secondary sources were also employed, including the two prior extensive treatments of Calvin's concept of faith by Peter Brunner (1925) and Simon Pieter Dee (1918).

An attempt is here made to present a relatively exhaustive and critical treatment of the manifold aspects of the concept of faith. The body of the dissertation falls into two main parts: (1) a study of faith as a cognitive trans-action; (2) a discussion of faith as a saving trans-action.



Under the discussion of faith as a process of knowing, such topics as these are treated: the competence of the human mind for knowing God, the noetic marks of faith, the question of whether there is a knowledge of God apart from faith, the mystical union with Christ, and the relation of faith to Scripture. The analysis of the redemptive character of faith includes discussions of the relation of faith to justification, repentance, the tensions of life, Christian liberty, prayer, the Church and the sacraments, and the hope for a future life.

The chief contention of the thesis is that the concept of faith is the key doctrine in Calvin's system of thought; for it is the necessary and sufficient condition for true knowledge of God, the means of justification, the cause of repentance, the origin of peace, joy, and courage, the entrance into the Church, the impetus to prayer, the source of Christian liberty, and the basis of Christian morality. In his writings Calvin relates every important doctrine of his system to the concept of faith.

This thesis was privately published by the author in 1952 under the title, *A Critical Study of Calvin's Concept of Faith*, and is available from him.

"The Brownist Churches: A Study in English Separatism, 1553-1630" by Verne Dale Morey. (Bridgeton, Maine.) Harvard, 1954. Director: Professor George H. Williams.

This study is the history of a movement and the delineation of the structure of a church. One problem was to ascertain precisely what Brownism was in order to make the proper distinctions between it and competing polities. Another problem was the relation of Brownist leaders to the movement at any given time, for their mobility was notorious, e.g. John Smyth became a Baptist, John Robinson a Congregationalist, Francis Johnson a Presbyterian, and Robert Browne an Anglican. There seemed to be no good reason for excluding those pre-Brownist groups, such as the Marian Separatist church at

Frankfort, who had similar motivations and a similar ecclesiology to those of Brownists and whom the Brownists regarded as their immediate spiritual forebears. There is even less reason for regarding the Barrowists as non-Brownists, for a close examination of their writings reveals them to have precisely the same ecclesiology and polity as Brownists. Brownism was the first sectarian movement in English religious history to establish and maintain churches in opposition to the Establishment. Brownist authors were controversialists. First, Anglicanism had to be repudiated and proved incorrigibly evil, then Brownist ecclesiology had to be positively developed and defended against Anglicanism and Presbyterianism. Later on, when the Congregationalists and Baptists appeared, the literary struggle became more intense.

A major conclusion has been to remove Robert Browne from the genetic tree of Congregationalism. Perry Miller's most important contribution to Congregational historiography was to identify the Congregationalism of Massachusetts Bay as non-Separatist while allowing for a Separatist Congregationalism, actually Brownism. This study carries the view one step further and makes Brownism a distinct ecclesiological type which ran its course and disappeared. A Brownist church was a company of faithful and holy people bound together by means of a covenant and possessing an apparatus for detaching the unworthy. The Brownist church had five offices—pastor, teacher, governing elder, deacon, and widow—the first three formed a governing body, a presbytery without real authority. Assuming themselves to be forming a church on biblical patterns, they were Calvinistic with ecclesiological deviations. The two forces that hastened Brownist disintegration were its own tendency to fragmentation because of unresolved inner assumptions and the rapid rise of Baptists and Congregationalists.

All secondary material was closely examined but the study is based on the

rather large amount of primary literature. Of first importance was the collecting and examining of all books, pamphlets, and documents written at the time Brownism was a living movement and relating to the subject. Polard and Redgrave's *Short Title Catalogue* and Dexter's *Congregationalism* proved most valuable although many items not listed in either of these were turned up. The author had the complete cooperation of the several large libraries of the east coast strong in this field and Houghton Library (Harvard University) ordered on microfilm any desired item from England, Holland, Chicago or the Huntington Library. More than sixty Brownist and anti-Brownist items previously unavailable on this side of the Atlantic are now accessible at Houghton.

"Theodore Parker" by John H. Martin. (Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio.) Chicago, 1953. Director: Professor Sidney E. Mead.

There have been many biographies of Theodore Parker, but most of the authors of these biographies have concentrated on but one aspect of Parker's life or work. Parker has been viewed as the leading preacher of the era before the Civil War, as the reformer-abolitionist, as the liberal theologian, and as the intellectual gourmand whose appetite could not be bound. While these works have made valuable studies of single aspects of Theodore Parker, few have tried to show the direct relationship between Parker the thinker and Parker the reformer. Too often Parker's theology and reform have been treated by biographers in separate categories, as though each could have come about if the other had never existed. It is against this compartmentalization of his thought and life that this thesis has been written.

The thesis takes Parker from his arrival, in his twenty-first year, in Boston, through his decision to enter the Divinity School at Harvard. It shows the slow growth in his reli-

gious thought from the staid, conservative Unitarianism of his day to a broader view of the Bible and religion during these years at Harvard and afterwards. Under the influence of the German critics whose books he was reading from 1834 to 1842, and under the influence of the transcendentalist circle in Boston, of which he was a member, he formed a liberal theology which caused him to be ostracized by his fellow Unitarians but brought him the largest congregation in New England.

Parker soon discovered that his religious views were meaningless unless applied, and thus after 1845 he decided to follow the Christian faith in all its implications and he bound himself to the side of the reform movements of the day. Thus it was from his religious grounding that he became one of the leading abolitionists and reformers. The thesis then carries through the story of his part in the reform movements prior to the Civil War and shows the maturing of his religious thought which brought to his side the young men of the Unitarian faith who could no longer abide the conservatism of their fathers. The thesis also attempts to show how the split within Unitarianism was inevitable after the Civil War because of the bitterness engendered over Parker's liberalism—a liberalism which was eventually to win out in Unitarianism and Protestantism in general in America.

"The History of the Disciples of Christ in Texas, 1824-1906" by Carter E. Boren (University of Houston). Chicago, 1952. Directors: Professors William Warren Sweet and Sidney E. Mead.

This work is an account of the history of the Disciples of Christ in Texas. It traverses the period from the initial entrance of Anglo-Saxon Disciples into Texas (then a province of Mexico), twelve years before the Republic, to 1906, the date of the first listing of the separated "Churches of Christ" in the Federal Census.

Special emphasis is given to the thesis that the periodization used for the Disciples in general must be modified when dealing with the Southwestern and Western frontier which came into existence forty to seventy years later than the Midwestern frontier in which the Disciples had their beginning. The Texas history exhibits some distinctive characteristics which are unique in the general history of the Disciples. An additional schismatic principle is peculiar to Texas. The evolution of the old-time camp meetings into a combined form of camp meeting and educational institute in the early years of the twentieth century is also a unique pattern. Conclusions are drawn which emphasize the limited degree of maturity attained by this religious group in Texas.

The treatment is divided into four parts. Part One, "The Early History," traces the record from 1824 to 1880, ending just at the time organizational development became a conscious problem in Texas. Part Two, "The Middle History," depicts the era of controversy from 1880 to 1906, the last year being the date when the anti-missionary and anti-organ group received recognition in the Federal Census for their complete separation by a sep-

arate listing of "Churches of Christ." A section of this part is devoted to local court trials which point up the schismatic doctrine peculiar to Texas Disciples. Part Three, "Structural Development," traces institutional growth and organizational arrangement. Part Four, "Entering the Twentieth Century," draws together a composite picture of the attitudes and actions of the Texas Disciples.

The sources for this work comprised: (1) the usual secondary books and periodicals within the general movement of the Disciples, particularly *The Millennial Harbinger*, *The Missionary Tidings*, and others; (2) the Texas state and county histories; (3) numerous state and community religious periodicals (some of them brought to light during the course of research); (4) *Disciple Year Books*; and (5) local primary sources centered chiefly in the archives of the Texas Christian Missionary Society, Texas Christian University, other Texas colleges, and in the Disciple Room of the library at Texas Christian University. Since the Disciples have been a religious body not given to keeping records, their journals are the best source material for their history.

## SURVEYS

### BRITISH CHURCH HISTORY

Bengt Sundkler, *Church of South India: The Movement towards Union, 1900-1947* (1954), is an impartial and detailed presentation of the story of the long struggle for a united church in South India. As such, it provides an introduction to the issue which has provoked among Anglicans an extensive historical re-examination of the doctrine of the historic episcopate. In 1950 the Church of England postponed for five years its decision as to its relationship to the Church of South India. With the approach of the date when this issue must be decided, numerous studies dealing with the question have been appearing. E. R. Fairweather and R. F. Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion* (1953) is an interchange of papers between two Canadians, one an Anglo-Catholic and the other an Evangelical. While retreating at some points from the position represented by *The Apostolic Ministry* (1946), ed. K. E. Kirk, Fairweather continues to insist that episcopacy is of the *esse* of the church. Hettlinger, on the other hand, takes the equally conventional point of view that it is only of the *bene esse* of the church. The members of the faculty of Wescott House, however, in *The Historic Episcopate in the Fullness of the Church* (1954), ed. K. M. Carey, give the argument a new slant by suggesting that episcopacy is "a necessary mark of the Church's fullness rather than an indispensable qualification for being a part." Thus episcopacy is best conceived as being of the *plene esse* of the church. Two important articles dealing with the situation in the early church are Einar Molland, "Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the Apostolic Succession," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, April, 1950, and W. Telfer, "Episcopal Succession in Egypt," *ibid.*, April, 1952. Arnold Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two*

*Centuries of the Church* (1953) provides a general survey. From the point of view of specifically Anglican doctrine, G. W. Bromily, "Anglicanism and the Ministry," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, March, 1954, suggests that "episcopacy as understood by Anglicans of the sixteenth century need not involve an organizational obstacle to reunion, "nor need it constitute" a dogmatic obstacle to intercommunion with those bodies which have not maintained a historical continuity of orders." A middle ground is found by Norman Sykes, *The Church of England and the Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century: an Essay towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake* (1949), in the "solid, restrained, and convincing defense of that form of church polity built up by Anglican divines," which has as its corollary the insistence that "episcopacy must be the basis and foundation of ecclesiastical reunion" while refusing "to unchurch those foreign churches which lacked it or to set forward an exclusive claim for this form of church polity." "Though the foreign non-episcopal churches might be regarded as defective, they were allowed to be true parts of the catholic church and their members were admitted to receive Holy Communion in Anglican churches." The forthcoming publication of Norman Sykes' Gunning Lectures at the University of Edinburgh, *Old Priest and New Presbyterian*, gives promise of providing an illuminating discussion of the Episcopal and Presbyterian points of view since the Reformation.

Another feature of English religious history which is beginning to receive marked attention is the Evangelical Movement within the Church of England. Sympathetic interest in this much

neglected phase of the life of the established church was awakened by the publication of C. H. E. Smyth's *Simcon and Church Order* (1940). As a result numerous biographies and specialized studies have been appearing during the past few years. These include G. G. Cragg, *Grimshaw of Harworth: A Study in Eighteenth Century Evangelicalism* (1947); Bernard Martin, *John Newton* (1950); M. G. Jones, *Hannah More* (1952); G. C. B. Davies, *The Early Cornish Evangelicals, 1735-1760* (1951); the two volumes by M. L. Loane, *Oxford and the Evangelical Succession* (1950) and *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession* (1952); and F. W. B. Bullock's *History of Ridley Hall*, Vol. I (1941), Vol. II (1953). J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals at Oxford, 1735-1871* (1953), is a somewhat more inclusive study which describes a theological position rather than an ecclesiastical allegiance. The pressing need now is for a full-scale history of the movement, a need which is not adequately met by L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Early Evangelicals: A Religious and Social Study* (1953) which describes the movement as parallel to Methodism but not derived from it. For an incisive criticism of Elliott-Binns, see J. S. Reynolds, "On Writing the History of the Evangelical Revival," *The Churchman* (Church Book Room Press), March, 1954.

Conyers Read has provided an engaging popular account of the English Reformation in *Social and Political Forces in the English Reformation* (1953), and L. B. Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics, 1536-1558* (1953) defends the middle-of-the-road bishops of the Reformation era and explains how and why they moved from a moderate humanism to an intolerant authoritarianism. H. S. Darby, *Hugh Latimer* (1953) is a competent study by a sympathetic interpreter, while D. S. Bailey, *Thomas Becon* (1952) is much less satisfactory. Two essays of some general interest are P. A. Duhamel, "The Oxford Lectures of John Colet: An Essay in Defining the English Renaissance," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, October, 1953, and C. C.

Butterworth, "Erasmus and Bilney and Fox," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, December, 1953.

English Puritanism continues to be a field of major interest. *Puritan Manifestoes*, ed. by W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, first published in 1907, has been re-issued in 1953 with an introduction by Norman Sykes. The second volume of English Nonconformist Texts, *The Writings of Robert Harris and Robert Browne* (1953), ed. Albert Peel and L. H. Carlson, has also come from the press. Interesting in connection with Browne, is Verne D. Morey's summary of his Harvard University dissertation in "History Corrects Itself: Robert Browne and Congregational Beginnings," *Bulletin of the American Congregational Association*, January, 1954. Douglas Horton comments, in an introduction to the essay, that "this important monograph might have been entitled 'Goodbye, Mr. Browne,' for it definitely and finally bows Robert Browne out of Congregationalism." A more extended comment on Morey's thesis is by R. S. Paul, "Shall We Rewrite Our History?" *Congregational Quarterly*, July, 1954.

The growing concern for an adequate definition of Puritanism is reflected in the symposium on the nature of Puritanism in *Church History*, June, 1954. Jerald C. Brauer deals with the central theme and identifies within the general pattern four types of Puritan piety—the legalists, the evangelicals, the mystics, and the rationalists. The political aspect of Puritanism is explored by George L. Mosse, "Puritan Political Thought and the 'Cases of Conscience,'" and Alan Simpson, "Saints in Arms: English Puritanism as Political Utopianism." Specific attention to what Brauer identifies as the evangelical Puritan tradition is given by G. F. Nuttall, *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge: A Study in Tradition* (1951) and by Hugh Martin, *Puritanism and Richard Baxter* (1953). Nuttall describes the eagerness of the Puritan evangelicals for Christian unity, their impatience with doctrinal tests which divide, and their emphasis on the "heart-work and

heaven-work" which unite believers in Christian experience. Martin, after rehearsing briefly the history and various aspects of Puritanism, discusses the thought and activity of Baxter as representative of Puritanism at "its central moderate best." Nuttall gives further attention to Baxter in "Richard Baxter's Apology (1654): Its Occasion and Composition," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, January-April, 1953. Aspects of Puritan worship are discussed by W. W. Biggs, "The Controversy concerning Kneeling in the Lord's Supper after 1604," *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, August, 1953, and "Preparation for Communion: A Puritan Manual," *Congregational Quarterly*, January, 1954. In the latter essay, Biggs selects from among numerous manuals *A Communicant Instructed* (1651) as one of the most typical and rewarding for detailed analysis. B. K. Brown, "A Note on the Puritan Concept of Aristocracy," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, June, 1954, clarifies a term which has long introduced confusion into discussions of Puritan political thought. Clarification in another area is introduced by R. S. Michaelson, "Changes in the Puritan Concept of Calling or Vocation," *New England Quarterly*, September, 1953.

D. Brunton and D. H. Pennington, *Members of the Long Parliament* (1954) is a work of major importance. A detailed analysis of the members of the English parliament between 1640 and 1653 reveals no significant difference in family background between Royalists and Parliamentarians and suggests that religious faith and conviction was the important factor in determining party affiliation. The thesis that "the Independents (politically)" were also "Presbyterians (religiously)" has been challenged, however, by George Yule of the University of Melbourne in an essay which is not yet published. Maurice Ashley, *Cromwell's Generals* (1954), is a popular study of those men—Fairfax, Blake, Monk, Ireton, etc.—upon whom Cromwell was forced to depend so heavily. One of the left-wing parties which became disaffected with the Protectorate is

discussed by R. T. Jones, "Vavasor Powell and the Protectorate," *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, August, 1953.

Richard Schlatter, "The Higher Learning in Puritan England," *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, June, 1954, describes the Puritan intellectual concern, and Peter Munz, *The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought* (1952), seeks to demonstrate that Hooker was out of touch with the Puritan mind and thus failed to meet the intellectual challenge of Puritanism. Had Hooker understood either Plato or Erasmus as well as he understood Aristotle, Munz asserts, he might have been able to bridge the gap.

Among other recent studies dealing with intellectual currents in the English religious scene are J. T. Addison, "Early Anglican Thought, 1559-1667," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, September, 1953; R. N. Stromberg, *Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth Century England* (1954) which deals with the rise and decline of English rationalism from Locke to Hume; L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Development of English Theology in the Late Nineteenth Century* (1952), not particularly perceptive or suggestive in its treatment of the period; and L. B. Smedes, *The Incarnation: Trends in Modern Anglican Thought* (1953), which deals with the central themes of English theology in the thought of Gore, Quick, Relton, Temple, Weston, and others.

The revival of interest in P. T. Forsyth should be noted as a manifestation of the concern with another of the intellectual currents in English religious history. No fewer than ten of Forsyth's books have been reprinted within the past six or seven years. Two major studies of Forsyth were published almost simultaneously—R. M. Brown, *P. T. Forsyth: Prophet for Today* (1952) and W. L. Bradley, *P. T. Forsyth: The Man and His Work* (1952). These supplement the earlier study by G. O. Griffith, *The Theology of P. T. Forsyth* (1948).

T. Cauter and J. S. Downham, *The Communication of Ideas* (1954) rep-



resents the increasing British interest in sociological description and contains the results, among other things, of a survey of the religious habits, activities, and affiliation of the people of Derby. John Highet, "Scottish Religious Adherence," *British Journal of Sociology*, June, 1953, traces the trends over the past century in Scottish church membership, attendance, ministerial supply, and financial support, and makes comparisons with tendencies in England and Wales. Particularly interesting use is made of church attendance statistics which were compiled in the census of 1851. Perhaps the most useful study of this type is B. S. Rowntree and G. R. Lavers, *English Life and Leisure* (1951) in which the previous studies of York by Rowntree in 1901 and 1935 are supplemented by the results of a 1948 survey.

Several specialized studies of real interest are C. K. Francis, *A History of the English Clergy, 1800-1900* (1953) which focuses attention on the decade or two following 1832 and seeks to illuminate the significance and implications of that complex process summarized in the phrase "the Reform of the Church;" A. Tindal Hart,

William Lloyd (1952) a biography of a consummate trimmer who, following the Restoration, was successively bishop of St. Asaph, Lichfield, and Worcester; W. A. Campbell Stewart, *Quakers and Education* (1953), an account of Quaker educational ventures in England since 1779; R. Newton Flew, *The Hymns of Charles Wesley* (1953); and E. G. Rupp, "Some Reflections on the Origin and Development of the English Methodist Tradition, 1738-1898," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July, 1953.

In the field of general surveys, Norman Sykes, *The English Religious Tradition* (1954) is an engaging popular account of English church life, in its various manifestations, since the Reformation, and it reflects the mature wisdom of England's most prominent church historian. J. R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England* (1953) is a scholarly and well-written denominational history which replaces Wakeman, Patterson, and Watson as the standard text in the field. S. C. Carpenter, *The Church in England, 597-1688* (1954) is another competent and useful survey.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON  
*Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*

## MEDIEVAL CHURCH HISTORY

An unaltered reissue, still important for world history, medieval culture, and ecclesiastical life, is A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (5 vols., 7 ed., Berlin/Leipzig, 1952-1953). The first of two volumes in A. Randa's *Handbuch der Weltgeschichte* (Freiburg i/B, 1954) has especially useful summations on Eastern Christendom and Islam through the medieval period. A well balanced treatment of *The Mind of the Middle Ages*, by F. B. Artz (New York, 1953), has rich bibliographical resources and an interest transcending its college text-book range; an enlarged revision is forthcoming shortly. Likewise useful beyond the college survey field are M. W. Baldwin's widely ramifying essays on *The Mediaeval Church* (Ithaca, 1953). A realistic analysis of the methods, limitations, hazards, and possible benefits of statistical researches is that of B. Guillemin, "Chiffres et statistiques pour l'histoire ecclésiastique du moyen âge, *Le Moyen âge*, LIX, 3-4 (1953), 341-365. The discussion of P. Kibre on "Scholarly Privileges: Their Roman Origins and Medieval Expression," *American Historical Review*, LIX, 3 (April, 1954), 543-567, is a solid contribution to the history of church and universities. S. H. Thomson reproduces "Two Early Portraits of Robert Grosseteste," in *Medievalia et Humanistica*, Fasc. 8 (1954), 20-21. H. Hassinger, in *Geographische Grundlagen der Geschichte* (2 ed., Freiburg, 1953) has chapters useful for the ecclesiastical historiographer. His "Literaturverzeichnis," pp. 293-356, is extended and up-to-date. A sumptuous work not hitherto remarked in these reports is F. Van Der Meer, *Atlas de la civilisation occidentale* (Paris/Brussels, 1952).

K. J. Conant's report on "Mediaeval Academy Excavations at Cluny: VIII—Final Stages of the Project," *Speculum*, XXIX, 1 (Jan., 1954), 1-43 is

a magnificent boon to the fields of Christian art, archeology, liturgy, and iconography. Full references to previous reports are given, together with the present text and plates. An authoritative combination of documented text and iconographic illustration is G. H. Cook, *The English Mediaeval Parish Church* (London, 1954). See, also, G. Hutton-E. Graham, *English Parish Churches* (London, 1952), for photographic plates of great beauty. Much credit is due Skira for its superior printing and color reproduction in A. Grabar's excellent *Byzantine Painting*, translated by S. Gilbert (Geneva, 1953). A treasured tapestry of the New York Cloisters is well reproduced and analyzed by J. J. Rorimer, Director and Curator of Medieval Art, in "The Glorification of Charles VIII," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, XII, 10 (June, 1954), 281-299; with "Notes on the Religious Iconography," *Ibid.*, pp. 300-301, by M. B. Freeman, Associate Curator. In the same journal, pp. 302-317, is "An Early Altarpiece from the Cathedral of Florence," by M. Meiss. *Russian Icons* (New York, 1953), with appropriate introduction and notes by P. Schweinfurth, is a handsome work of fourteen color plates and twelve full-page illustrations. E. Benz *et al.* have provided a valuable set of translations with notes and fifty-two illustrations in *Russische Heiligenlegenden* (Zurich, 1953). F. Wormald has performed a rare paleogeographical service via *The Miniatures in the Gospel of St. Augustine, Corpus Christi College MS. 286* (Cambridge, 1954), with nineteen superb plates. J. H. Baltzell's critical edition, *The Octosyllabic vie de Saint Denis* (Geneva, 1953) puts the anonymous French poem in its proper relation to both the historical and the legendary St. Denis. *Liturgik des römischen Ritus*, by J. Lechner-L. Eisenhofer (6 ed., Freiburg, 1953), is a well or-

ganized study, with full literature, of Catholic liturgical forms, Mass, Sacraments, Sacramentals, and Breviary.

Studies relating canon law, heresy, and inquisition include A. Borst's copiously documented researches into the antecedents, doctrines, organization, history, and literature of *Die Katharer*, *Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, 12; Stuttgart, 1953); also representative articles on hierarchy, inquisition, Hincmar, Innocent III, and William Durand in A. Naz, ed., *Dictionnaire du Droit Canonique*, V (Paris, 1953). Note, also, the article on "Ockham, The Conciliar Theory, and the Canonists," by B. Tierney, in *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, XV, 1 (Jan., 1954), 40-70, and the illuminating insights into the classical concept of canon law in relation to post-Reformation England by R. C. Mortimer, Lord Bishop of Exeter, *Western Canon Law* (Berkeley, 1953). C. Reviglio Della Veneria's popular account, *L'inquisizione medioevale ed il processo inquisitorio* (2 ed., Turin, 1953) has some useful perspectives.

On the medieval papacy one may cite an excellent Latin-English parallel edition of *The Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III Concerning England* (1198-1216), by C. R. Cheney (London, 1953). Representative of the continuing editorial labors of the "Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," are *Les Registres d'Alexandre IV: Recueil des Bulles de ce Pape, pub. d'après les manuscrits originaux des archives Vatican*, Tome III, Fasc. VII, Années V, VI et VII par A. Coulon (Paris, 1953). Of fundamental interest, and with excellent literature, is J. B. Guillemain, "Punti Di Vista Sul Papato Avignonese," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, CXI (1953), 181-206.

The sweep of medieval philosophy, theology, and dogmatics may be reviewed through the outstanding reissues of J. Pohle-J. Gummersbach, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (10 ed., I, Paderborn, 1952-); M. J. Scheeben-C. Feckes-J. Höfer, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik* (2 ed., V. I, Freiburg, 1954); M. Prümmer, *Man-*

*uale Theologiae Moralis* (11 ed., I, Friburg i/B, 1953-); and M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik* (4 ed., IV, I, Munich, 1953-). A. M. Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik* (II, 2, Regensburg, 1954) is on the medieval "Lehre von Christus." G. Boas' translation of *The Mind's Road to God*, by Saint Bonaventura (New York, 1953), is lucid and dependable. M. Ladomersky, *Theologia Orientalis* (Rome, 1953), considers, principally, the main Roman differences with the Eastern Church on the Primacy of Peter, the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, Purgatory, and Epiclesis. Appended documents are germane. A. Rock, *The Theological Concept of Preaching According to St. Thomas Aquinas* (Dubuque, 1953), summarizes much of the purpose and method of Dominican predication. Olaf Pedersen, "The Development of Natural Philosophy 1250-1350," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, XIV, 1, 2 (1953), 86-155, relates Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Jean de Mirecourt, the Ockhamists, Thomas Bradwardine, and others to church, university, and medieval science. A highly specialized study is L. Meier, "Über den Zeugniswert der 'Reportatio' in der Scholastik," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XXXVI, 1 (1954), 1-8. P. Delhay examines "Le bien suprême d'après le *Policraticus* de Jean de Salisbury," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XX (1953), 203-221. Damian Van den Eynde has contributed valuable "Nouvelles précisions chronologiques sur quelques oeuvres théologiques du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Franciscan Studies*, N.S. XIII, 2-3 (June-Sept., 1953), 71-118. In the same issue, pp. 119-146, see K. F. Lynch, "Some *Fontes* of the *Commentary* of Hugh De Saint Cher: William of Auxerre, Guy D'Orchelles, Alexander of Hales."

Among the more careful studies of monastic life and rules are B. Steidle's characteristically meticulous *Die Regel Benedikts* (Beuron/Hohenzollern, 1952), with German translation, critical introduction, excursuses, and notes; E. Von Hippel's *Die Krieger Gottes:*

*Die Regel Benedikts als Ausdruck Frühchristlicher Gemeinschaftsbildung* (2 ed., Paderborn, 1953); D. Knowles' and R. N. Hadcock's carefully statistical *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* (New York, 1953); and W. Nigg's readable, orderly *Vom Geheimnis der Mönche* (Zurich/Stuttgart, 1953), emphasizing the period from Anthony through the Jesuits. Igor Smolitsch has a massive investigation in *Russisches Mönchtum: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Wesen, 988-1917* (Würzburg, 1953), of which pp. 9-43 are bibliography and pp. 44-100 particularly applicable to the Middle Ages.

M. D. Chenu thoughtfully examines the vitality of the Christian gospel in the varied states of social-ecclesiastical life in "Moines, clercs, laïcs au carrefour de la vie évangélique (XII<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *Revue de histoire ecclésiastique*, XLIX, 1 (1954), 59-89.

The eighth century of St. Bernard's death naturally produced a set of varied studies on his far-reaching influence. A representative group, all published in 1953, is examined here. One of the most comprehensively methodical of these was produced by the "Commission d'histoire de l'ordre de Cîteaux, Abbaye N. D. D'Aiguebelle, par Grignan, Drome, France, III: *Bernard De Clairvaux* (Paris, 1953). Virtually every aspect of Bernard's life and work is treated by a large group of responsible scholars in a book of peculiarly valuable tables and indexes—chronological, genealogical, alphabetical, bibliographical, and analytical. E. Willems, "Cîteaux et la seconde Croisade," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* XLIX, 1 (1954), 116-151 is a first-class analysis of Bernard's role. Bernard's personality, doctrinal characteristics and writings are briefly delineated in P. Tommaso Piatti, "Notae et disputationes: Uno storico centenario: San Bernardo di Chiaravalle 1153-20 Agosto—1953, *Divus Thomas*, A. LVI (XXX, Ser. III<sup>ae</sup> 1953), 391-402. B. Jacqueline's "Saint-Bernard de Clairvaux et la Curie Romaine," *Rivista Di Storia Della Chiesa in Italia*, VII, 1 (Gennaio-Aprile, 1953), 27-44 is an examination of

curial corruption and reform seen against the background of the *Epistolae* and the *De Consideratione*. Cistercian reform is viewed as a reaction against the abuses of centralization and luxury in the twelfth-century Roman court even as that reform had been a protest against the centralization and luxury of Cluny. J. Calmette-H. David, in *Saint Bernard* (Paris) examine the great Cistercian apropos ascetic discipline, the papacy, heresy, mysticism, crusades, oratorical and literary arts, Eugenius III, and *De Consideratione*, as well as the Marian cult. P. Bernard, abbaye de Sept-Fons, in his *Saint Bernard et Notre Dame* (Paris) supplies a useful anthology of Latin texts and French translations of Marial passages drawn from the homiletic works. A pertinently annotated, yet lively study, is P. Dumontier, *Saint Bernard et la Bible* (Paris). Elisabeth von Schmidt-Pauli in her popularly written *Bernard von Clairvaux: Lebensbild* (Dusseldorf) punctuates a large group of running summaries and questions with source interjections on Bernard's home life and cloistral experience, as well as his relation to schism, heresy, and crusades. A much needed translation is B. S. James', *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (London). A German translation of J. Leclercq's anthology of ascetic and devotional writings is *Bernhard von Clairvaux: Die Botschaft der Freude* (Cologne). In *Saint Bernard, Oeuvres Mystiques*, D'Albert Beguin translates, *On the Love of God, Sermons On the Canticles* and certain Marial works.

Recent researches in renunciation and mysticism include W. Maurer's "Zum Verständnis der heiligen Elisabeth von Thüringen," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vierte Folge III, LXV, Heft 1 and 2, Basel 1953/54, 16-64. In this connection see Nesta de Robeck's *Saint Elizabeth of Hungary: A Story of Twenty-Four Years* (Milwaukee, 1953). A. Grion presents, in *Santa Caterina da Siena: Dottrina e Fonte* (Brescia, 1953), a series of provocative literary-historical studies and texts that show Catherine's typical theological emphases in relation to

characteristically Dominican spiritual traits. A new German translation of Thomas A. Kempis is *Die Nachfolge Christi, neuübertragen nach dem herkömmlichen lateinischen Urtext mit den Anmerkungen* by F. De Lamennais (Zürich/Köln, 1953).

The *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*, 1949-1952 (Chicago,

1953), issued by the American Theological Library Association, is exclusive of the many listings on religion already covered by *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* and *The International Index to Periodicals*.

RAY C. PETRY

Duke University Divinity School.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*A Centenary History as Related to the Baptist General Conference of America.* By ADOLPH OLSON. Chicago, Illinois: Baptist Conference Press, 1952. xiii and 635 pages. \$7.50.

In 1852 a small group of Swedish immigrants organized at Rock Island, Illinois, the first Swedish Baptist Church in America. A hundred years later Professor Olson tells the story of the growth of the Baptist General Conference of America from that small beginning to the present day.

This is the first comprehensive treatment of the Baptist General Conference. Other limited works have preceded it. In the Preface the author acknowledges A. G. Hall's two volume *Svenska Baptisternas Historia* which was published "at the turn of the century," and J. O. Backlund's *Swedish Baptists in America*. Professor Olson began his study in 1924 at the request of the Conference. This volume is the result of "more than a quarter of a century of study, consciously directed toward the writing of this book."

Great devotion and labor have gone into the preparation of this study. It is the account of an insider and, in part, of an eyewitness. Nevertheless the author has managed remarkably well to avoid the pitfalls involved in "the difficulty of being impartial in all matters," a difficulty of which he was keenly aware. Actually his work leaves the reader with the feeling that the story has been told with almost an excess of restraint.

Because the Baptist General Conference of America is a relatively small body, some 360 churches with about 49,000 members, the author has been able to treat of many men, incidents and movements within his field which would have been passed over had the body been larger. The result is the inclusion of "minutiae" which in the hands of a less skillful historian could have become not only boring but a hindrance to the full vision of the

sweep of the history of the group. The detail of the work is remarkable, but the author's love for biography lifts the detail far above a recital of facts and figures.

The book is divided into three parts. Part One, "Pioneering," treats of background and the laying of the foundations from 1852 to about 1883. Part Two, "The Era of Expansion," tells the story of the growth of the body by geographical areas. Part Three, "Institutional Work and Missionary Achievements," accomplishes precisely the goal set for it, and is concluded with a chapter on "Trends in Faith and Life." Appended are sections on "Historical Highlights," an "Historical Table" listing the annual meetings of the General Conference, and an excellent working bibliography for the study of Swedish Baptist History.

It is to be hoped that others of our smaller groups will follow the lead established in this book and make their history known in similarly complete fashion. The entire area of American Church History, which has benefited by the publication of this book, can profit greatly from such a series of studies.

RICHARD C. WOLF  
*Oberlin School of Theology.*

*Jew and Greek: A Study in the Primitive Church.* By DOM GREGORY DIX. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. Pp. vii - 119. \$2.50.

This is a posthumous publication, which for all the care that Canon H. J. Carpenter has brought to its editing still betrays a number of loose ends. "From the fact that Barnabas does not join in despatching Galatians, . . . we must infer that his 'hypocrisy' still continued at that moment" (p. 46). But since Barnabas was not even in the neighbourhood of St. Paul at the time, how could he possibly join in the writing of the letter? "Perhaps the riots (at Rome, in the time of



Claudius) were directed against Andronicus and Junias" (p. 31); this conjecture, wholly baseless in itself, rests upon the presupposition that Romans 16 was written to the Roman church, which is most unlikely. "The Jews were leaderless and disunited when they rose in their despairing rebellion in A.D. 66, yet it took four years' hard fighting and the crack troops of the Roman army to put them down" (p. 21). But for the greater part of those four years Vespasian was using the bulk of his army to win and consolidate his power in Italy, and hostilities in Judaea were virtually suspended for the better part of three years; once Titus had his legions, the Jewish resistance was rapidly crushed.

The main thesis of the book is that the sub-apostolic church, as we discern it in the writings of Clement of Rome and Ignatius, "already sacramental, liturgical, hierarchical in principle, already 'Catholic,'" (p. 3) is the legitimate continuation of the Apostolic church, not a radical transformation into something of an essentially different character. In the course of the argument, Dix has offered an ingenious and even brilliant interpretation of the evidence of Acts and Galatians concerning the relations of St. Paul with the Jerusalem church and its apostolic leaders, and the whole problem of the admission of Gentiles to the church. But perhaps the most striking feature of the book is its assessment of the historical significance of the Gospel according to St. Mark. "It reflects the essence of Palestinian Jewish Christianity before A.D. 49 even more clearly and simply than does St. Paul" (p. 57). "Historically, it is the Palestinian Gospel at its most authentic, in the recollections of Peter, which underlies Mark closely everywhere. But the material has been most subtly adapted to the purpose of the writer—to evoke 'faith' from Gentiles" (p. 72); and its effect is "the tying of the dogma of Jesus' Messiahship to the facts of his history in Palestine. . . . But the riveting of this conception upon the whole Gentile-Christian Church, which was going to be forced to think *metaphysically*

about the dogma, at the very moment when the Jewish-Christian 'Apostolic' generation was handing over the task of its proclamation to the untested Gentile-Christian future—this and no less was the personal achievement of 'Mark'" (p. 74).

Sweeping as it is, and exaggerated, this claim for Mark has a substantial measure of justification, and should not be too lightly dismissed, even if we are less confident than Dom Gregory of the presence of Peter behind this Gospel. It should be remarked that Dix was neither ignorant of nor hostile to general critical positions, and his argument is seldom or never dependent upon the acceptance of a traditional position that is seriously disputed by competent scholars.

F. W. BEARE

Trinity College, Toronto.

*Augustine: Earlier Writings.* Edited by JOHN H. S. BURLEIGH. The Library of the Christian Classics, Volume 6. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. 413 pages. \$5.00.

This is one of three volumes to be devoted to St. Augustine's writings in the 26-volume "Library" now well under way. Eight selected writings are included in the present volume. Preceding the English translation of each, Mr. Burleigh has provided a brief introduction, an outline-analysis of the contents, and a reprinting of St. Augustine's own comments in the *Retractions*. Readers will particularly welcome Burleigh's translations of the *De Vera Religione*, the *De Natura Boni*, and the *De Diversis Quaestionibus*.

The *De Vera Religione* (A.D. 394) is of value, among other reasons, as showing Augustine's attitude toward Platonism at a time midway between his conversion and the writing of his *Confessions*. Augustine is here arguing to convert his old patron Romanus, and he tells him that Christ, by healing the minds of men, has made generally available the blessed life which Plato saw afar off; so that if Plato could return now he would

"with the change of a few words and sentiments" become Christian—"as many Platonists of recent time have done." Why, then, "yearn for the darkness of yesterday"? Why "are we so eager to mouth the name of Plato rather than to have the truth in our hearts"? A second theme, eloquently handled, is the glory of divine providence, by which even the enemies of the Catholic Church unwittingly assist it. For the Church makes use "of heretics to try its own doctrine, of schismatics to prove its stability, of the Jews as a foil to its own beauty." Heretics outside the Church do it good, "not by teaching the truth, for they do not know it, but by provoking carnal Catholics to seek the truth and spiritual Catholics to expound it. . . . So, many are awakened from sleep by the heretics, that they may see God's light and be glad." A third theme is that of the priority of faith and authority to reason—a theme which Augustine had argued at length in the *De Utilitate Credendi*, a translation of which Burleigh also gives us in this volume.

The *De Natura Boni* (A.D. 404), like the *De Vera Religione*, is directed against Manicheism. It elaborates another major theme of the earlier treatise, namely, that evil is simply absence of goodness, loss of wholeness or integrity—in short, "nothing but the corruption of natural measure, form, and order." Likewise sin "is not a seeking of something evil by nature, but an abandonment of something better." "God had not planted a bad tree in paradise. But he who had forbidden the tree to be touched was better than the tree."

The *De Quaestionibus Ad Simplicianum* (A.D. 397) is written to the same Simplicianus who had aided Augustine's conversion. Book I, here translated, contains an exegesis of two difficult passages in the Epistle to the Romans; it shows that Augustine had been steeping himself more in St. Paul than in Plato. Expounding Romans 7:7-25 he defends the law as a good thing, though incapable of giving power to perform that to which it points. Expounding Romans 9:10-29,

on grace and free will, he asserts that faith itself is among the gifts of grace, so that even willing is not wholly ours.

Also included in this excellent volume are translations of the *Soliloquia*, the *De Magistro*, the *De Libero Arbitrio*, and the *De Fide et Symbolo*.

ROY W. BATTENHOUSE  
*Indiana University.*

---

*An Humble Supplication to Her Maiestie*, by ROBERT SOUTHWELL: edited by R. C. Bald. New York: Cambridge University Press; October 1953; xxiv + 80. \$3.00.

Robert Southwell's *An Humble Supplication to her Maiestie* is now more easily available to the reader than when it was first in circulation towards the end of the reign of the first Elizabeth, or at any time since. Professor R. C. Bald, who has edited the text with proper care, and who has provided in his first two appendices materials relevant to its composition and early history, deserves the gratitude of all students of the religious struggle in England at the close of the sixteenth century, and of all those who are interested in an example of vigorous controversial prose.

The present edition is based on the manuscript Petyt 538.36 in the Library of the Inner Temple. In following the manuscript, which has features of careful copying and arrangement, Professor Bald is admittedly cautious in accepting some of the "corrections" it contains. In some instances it would appear that he has relaxed his vigil, as when he adopts the reading "to make our soules the price of infernall paine," (p. 3), in preference to the original phrase (when, instead of "infernall paine," the scribe had reproduced the ringing Southwellian paradox, "a condemning pardon."

Petyt MS. 538.36 and the Ellesmere manuscript, in comparison with the text of the printed edition of "1595," show signs of revision which Professor Bald suggests may have originated with the author. There are still a number of textual problems to be solved, however, and we have to concede that many changes may have crept into the

text between the time when Southwell was "forced to commit it to the multitude," and the time of the preparation of the manuscripts we now know. The textual notes annexed to the present edition give little indication of the state of the printed text of "1595," which shows every sign of slovenliness and haste in setting, with numerous errors in spelling and punctuation.

In his Introduction Professor Bald gives a short summary of the circumstances of the writing of the *Supplication*, and a longer account of the later history of its publication and use by the appellants as an instrument to discredit in Rome the work of the Jesuits in England. Its composition can be dated more accurately than any other of Southwell's works, (except the "Epistle of a religious priest, unto his father") since it was written hard upon the publication of the Queen's proclamation, dated 18 October 1591, but probably issued in late November. Southwell's attack was directed against the use made by Lord Burghley of his influence with the Queen to incite the country to renewed persecution of the Catholics. Professor Bald makes no reference to Burghley in connection with the proclamation, though it was called by Verstegan, "the new Cecilian inquisition," and Southwell attacks roundly and repeatedly the "heavy adversary" who had the Queen's ear. Burghley's personal hatred was displayed in the violent polemical language, and the *Supplication* answers rationally and powerfully each of the charges made.

There is some evidence that the *Supplication* was represented as a sign of a change of policy among the Jesuits in England (illustrated in the tale told of a priest, in *State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth*, Vol. 261, no. 99), but the distinction made by Southwell between Catholic hopes for clemency from the Queen, and loathing of the irrational tyranny of her minister, does not give sufficient authority for Professor Bald's statement that the concept of a national church is "implicit" in the work. Issues which were emergent at the time of the Archbishop controversy have unfortunately

coloured his estimate of this essentially "occasional" document. Expressions of loyalty to the Queen, later distorted by the appellants in the Latin memorial submitted to the Pope in 1602, were embodied in answers to Burghley's charges, in much the same way as the prisoners responded to the "bloody question," legally freeing themselves from the charge of treason, while leaving their theological position unassailed.

NANCY BROWN

*University of Indiana.*

*The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* by E. B. KOENKER. Chicago: The University Press, 1953, pp. 272. \$5.00.

This is a sympathetic and instructive review of the Roman liturgical movement from its beginnings in Maria Laach to the present. The author is a Lutheran, and an Assistant Professor of Religion at Valparaiso University. His work is the fruit of his research for the Ph.D. degree at Chicago. He covers a wide territory and has performed the useful service of bringing together the many scattered threads of this diverse movement, and of assembling and digesting the large and varied literature on the subject.

The titles and leading themes of the chapters indicate both the scope and the clear organization of the book: Historical Origins, Struggle for Community, Explicit versus Implicit Faith, New Emphasis on the General Priesthood, Return to Biblical Tradition, New Orientation in Offering the Eucharistic Sacrifices, The "Mysterien-theologie," Spirituality, Agitation for the Vernacular, Gregorian Chant, Artistic Expression and Ecumenicity.

Among the many points which Dr. Koenker emphasizes we may refer to one or two. For one thing he shows the *breadth* of the movement. This is something often neglected in considering the subject. The author is at pains to point out that Biblical renewal, Christian action and even aestheticism are vital aspects of the liturgical revival in different countries. Moreover,

taken as a whole, it is a "mighty reforming movement," whose spirituality may well change the whole direction of Romanism, and redeem it from the scholastic drought and sentimental piety of the post-Tridentine spirit. Then again, the writer shows how a number of movements from the 18th century onwards prepared the way for, and influenced, this liturgical renewal. He treats of Jansenism, the Enlightenment, Romanticism and Modernism, indicating how each of them was in a measure, a forerunner of current emphases.

The chapters dealing with various aspects of the Holy Sacrifice call for particular mention. The return to a corporate participation in the liturgy, in contrast to individualistic and often sentimental devotions, is well described. The layman's priesthood and the "mystery-theology" of Don Casel are given extended and accurate treatment. A great value of the book is that it is so up to date in its use of the literature and its mention of encyclicals and of regulations by the Liturgical Commission.

By way of criticism one may remark that the material in the extensive notes ought often to have been incorporated in the text. Under that desperate procedure whereby presses nowadays relegate all notes to the end of a book, so that they are as inaccessible as possible (and it is a procedure requiring infinite patience and alertness to look anything up), it would be wise for authors to confine their notes entirely to direct references. If they have an additional point, a sidelight or a good quotation, they *must* put it in the body of the text. Otherwise it is lost for ever. The notes of this volume cover some fifty closely printed pages, and these contain some of the most interesting material. It should have been in the text. For sometimes this latter is sketchy and needs the fuller body provided in the notes. This is especially true of some of the points on the "Mysterientheologie." At other times (but only rarely) the text is so abbreviated that it is hard to follow and confused (e.g. page 103).

There is a curious reference to the

Ambrosian rite on page 143, as if this were in another language than Latin. On page 191, mention is made of the Canon in Oriental rites being "chanted aloud." This is not so. Most of the Canon, including especially the Epi-  
clesis, is said *mystikós* (silently), though there are passages where the voice is raised, as at the Institution. Since, however, all this proceeds behind the ikonostasis, the question is not of great moment.

The chapter on art and architecture is really too brief to give much indication of the important trends here. Some pictures would have aided the reader's imagination.

But these criticisms are minor. No one interested in the Liturgical Movement can afford to miss Dr. Koenker's work, if for no other reason than its comprehensive survey of the field.

CYRIL C. RICHARDSON  
*Union Theological Seminary.*

---

*The Christian World Mission in Our Day.* By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. New York, Harpers and Bros., 1954. 192 p. \$2.50.

Professors of Christian missions and mission executives, would be disappointed if a year passed by without a book from the pen of Dr. Latourette. They also would find it disconcerting if the author should doubt or even question the growing influence of the Christian religion upon the institutions and cultures of the world. In *The Christian World Mission in Our Day* Dr. Latourette points to the increased knowledge of God and the ever-enriching and ever-expanding fellowship of Christian believers. Although the last three chapters allude to the power of perversion and evil which develop simultaneously with the growing Church, the visible Christian communities of the world reveal the gradual triumph of God within history.

The first two chapters summarize very briefly the environment of the 19th century and the expansion of the Church during that period. We are reminded of the phenomenal achievements of the missionary movement

which spanned the years from 1815 to 1914.

Chapter III portrays the world of today; its social, political, economic and religious convulsions. There are, for example, the collapse of the sophisticated social structure of China and the dying gasps of tribal society in primitive cultures. There are the pessimism of the West; the new hope of the East; the transference of the title "old world" to the U.S.A. and the emergence of a "new world" in Europe; the challenge of the notorious trio, secularism, nationalism, and communism.

Chapter IV contains a chain of interesting facts on the spread of Christianity in our day. The panoramic view includes the predominantly Protestant people of Batakland in Sumatra; the island of Madagascar; the Church among the people of South Africa where more than a fourth of the Africans are Protestants; the growing Protestant Church in Latin America, especially Brazil; and the spread of the Gospel in the U.S.A. Every significant cultural and national group is mentioned.

The concluding chapters deal with the questions of how we should go about the missionary task and what we may expect from the future. The answers are derived from an interpretation of the ways God works in history. It is well to remember that the Word became flesh "in the womb of an obscure virgin of an otherwise undistinguished village, and that when the incarnate Word was born it was in a manger, unnoticed by those whom the world called great."

The author finds hope for the final consummation of the Kingdom not only in the character and nature of God but in the expansion of the Church here on earth. The spread of the Gospel and its influence in all areas of life are sources of Christian hope.

Although one is inclined to question the historic optimism of the author and the significance of Jesus upon the new movements of our day, such as the United Nations, there is no doubt that we are indebted to Dr. Latourette

for a succinct, clear and moving summary of world Christianity and the challenge that the Church confronts today.

THEODORE F. ROMIG  
*McCormick Theological Seminary.*

*A Historical Approach to Evangelical Worship.* By ILION T. JONES.  
Nashville: Abingdon - Cokesbury,  
1954, 319 pages. \$4.50.

As an appeal from history, this protest against the liturgical movement in Protestantism is strangely lacking in the sensitivities which history affords. Little, if any value is found in tradition. Evangelicalism precludes catholicity. And the Protestant liturgist is directed back to the Church of the first two centuries—prior to that "apostate Christianity of medievalism," from which there was not a full recovery, in worship, until the middle of the nineteenth century. Only then did the Reformation, as a liturgical revolution, reach its climax; only then did the churches return to "the Puritan, informal, spontaneous, spirit-filled, evangelical type of worship of the New Testament" (p. 156). If there is a sense of history at all in these pages, it is the suggestion and the warning that, given 350 years, evangelical revivals are threatened by new waves of "formal," "sacramental," "priestly" religion. Hence, the beginning of the liturgical movement 350 years after the Reformation (1850) parallels the apostasy of the Church in the third and fourth centuries. "Thus the cyclic, or rhythmical, alternation of prophetic and priestly worship have followed one another in as yet an unbroken series" (p. 290).

Dr. Jones, professor of practical theology at San Francisco Theological Seminary, bases his historical section (Part I) largely upon the work of W. D. Maxwell and Gregory Dix. The objectivity of this section is open to question. And there are a number of statements needing support, e.g., that "spiritual" worship and "formal" worship are incompatible (pp. 13, 44); that emotion in worship comes largely, if not exclusively, from "sponta-

neity" (p. 85); that the early Christians had "an aversion to heathen art" (p. 102); that the Reformers "abolished the priesthood" (p. 141); and that physical symbols, being primarily for the unlettered, are detrimental to "spiritual" religion (p. 217). As history, these chapters are useful only in support of Dr. Jones' basic thesis. Maxwell and Dix have not been superseded.

An "evangelical cultus" is proposed in Part II. Appeal is made to Reformation faith; but since neither that faith nor its liturgical implications are considered deeply, the controlling doctrinal principles of the "evangelical cultus" appear rather vague. "Didactic elements must predominate if evangelical worship is to be preserved in its true form" (p. 217). Sacramentalism is "the way back to Catholicism" (p. 186). The priesthood of all believers excludes "priestcraft" in cultus. "The Lord's Supper is subordinate to, because dependent upon, the preaching . . . of the Word" (p. 184). And the only interpretation of the Supper which is suitable to an evangelical cultus is that taught by Zwingli (p. 199). Jones is embarrassed by the Reformers—by Luther's liturgical conservatism, by the "deposit of Catholic sacramentalism" in the major Reformed confessions (p. 199)—and finds his ideal in the worship of the American churches in the nineteenth century.

A lack of appreciation for the meaning of symbolism is an important characteristic of this book. Dr. Jones simply dismisses, without an attempt at understanding, many of the liturgical and physical symbols of the tradition. He is deeply afraid of "paganism" and "magic." The influence of the Mystery Religions he regards as scandalous. And, at last, he proposes to "invent" symbols which are consonant with the evangelical tradition (p. 264).

Dr. Jones appreciates that, lacking historical foundation, the liturgical movement is endangered by the sheer experimentation and then the extravagance which become the fashion. His "approach" is sound. But one might

have expected a more objective use of history and, indeed, a more committed study of the Reformers.

BARD THOMPSON

*Candler School of Theology*  
*Emory University, Georgia*

*The Reformation in England: II Religio Depopulata.* By PHILIP HUGHES, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954. 366 pp. \$7.50.

The second volume of Father Hughes's history of the English Reformation picks up the story in 1540 and carries it to the deaths of Mary and Pole on the same day in 1558. It is a magisterial account, based on wide knowledge of the sources, written with passion and a sense of irony, but full of special pleading. There is relatively little connected narrative, knowledge of the main events being assumed in the reader. The book is rather a loosely-woven tapestry of documentary analyses, criticism of Protestant historiography, investigation of disputed points, and polemical interpretation of major developments. The author leans heavily on Lingard and James Gairdner, and loses no opportunity to cross swords with A. F. Pollard, often victoriously. The result is a more vigorous and edifying account than the Abbé Constant's volumes on the same subject, but without Constant's judiciousness and sense of continuity.

The most useful thing Father Hughes has done is to measure precisely the deviations from orthodox Roman doctrine in the successive dogmatic and liturgical changes. He effectively exposes the practical absurdity of Henry VIII's "Catholicism without the Pope" by ferreting out the heresy not only in the Bishop's Book of 1537 but also in the King's Book of 1543. But in doing so he often seems to assume a firmness of Catholic belief which actually came into existence only after Trent. On the whole, the treatment of theological problems and of popular piety is always informed and illuminating, although consistently polemical. It is well for Protestant historians to be



reminded that there was little true "spirituality" in the reformers' homilies and tracts, that "Protestant zealots" often showed little evidence of Christian spirit, and that the level of Protestant political and economic morality was low. In driving these traditional Catholic points home, however, Father Hughes is equally critical of the *politiques* and time-servers upon whom the Roman Catholic cause was forced to depend.

In fact, the best thing about the book is its sense of the tragic dilemmas of the age. This comes out most clearly in the treatment of Mary's reign. Father Hughes does his best to cut the Marian persecutions down to size by emphasizing that Protestants too believed in burning heretics, that many of the Marian victims were very probably Anabaptists, that life was held cheaper then, and that it was the secular, not the ecclesiastical authorities which initiated most of the cases. But in the end he concludes that the really horrible thing about the burnings was the government's assumption that Englishmen could still be expected to know what true Catholic Christianity was after twenty years of heretical teaching. He goes out of his way to underscore the tragic irony of bishops who had once denied the papal supremacy sending victims to the stake for the same denial.

All too often Father Hughes's apologetic purpose leads him to distort the evidence. It is naive to argue that the papal restoration embodying the guarantee of the land settlement in Mary's reign was not a "bargain" because Julius III and Pole did everything they could to avoid its *appearing* as a bargain. The author maintains that there is no evidence the burnings were particularly unpopular until the publication of Foxe's book. This would not be so easy to argue if he had glanced at the diplomatic material after 1553 (he uses neither the voluminous sources in the Public Record Office nor recent monographic work after the last published volume of the *Spanish Calendar* for 1553). For instance, he nowhere brings out the fact that the Emperor and his ambassador

were strongly opposed to the burnings, and why. He writes that the idea "that to burn heretics is to offer a sacrifice to God is not Catholic," but Protestant (p. 254), quoting as "one root of the idea" Bullinger's letter to Calvin urging the execution of Servetus to show "that Geneva desires the glory of Christ to be maintained inviolate" (p. 279). But he also quotes a letter of Philip and Mary to Bonner scolding him because heretics "are suffered to continue in their errors, to the dishonour of God, and dangerous example of others" (p. 266)—which appears to be a second, and more Catholic, "root of the idea."

Altogether, this is a useful and penetrating, but often disappointing volume. As an interpretive essay by a sensitive and learned modern Catholic scholar, it has its place in history as "contemporary thought about the past." But it lacks the impartiality and command of the whole historical background, particularly the political, to become the classic modern account of the subject. There is a thorough table of contents, an inadequate bibliographical note, and an indifferent index.

E. HARRIS HARBISON

*Princeton University.*

*The Catholic Indian Missions and Grant's Peace Policy, 1870-1884.* By PETER J. RAHILL, Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1954, 396 pages, illustrated. \$5.00, cloth bound; \$4.25, paper bound.

Here is an excellent study of a little-developed aspect of missionary work among the American Indians. This is Volume XLI of the series of Studies in American Church History now being issued by the Catholic University of America. The author sets forth a detailed and scholarly account of the operation of President Grant's Peace Policy as it affected the Roman Catholic missionary work among the Indians. Fifty-one pages are devoted to the bibliography and index. In addition copious footnotes are found on almost every page.

Because of the scandals in the administration of Indian affairs by the War Department, President Grant initiated an experiment by asking the different denominations to cooperate with the Government in handling Indian affairs. Certain tribes or reservations were arbitrarily assigned to certain denominations which had the right to nominate the Indian agents involved and to supply missionary teachers for the schools subsidized by the Government. When such a tribe or reservation was so assigned, other denominations were told to stay away. According to the author of this book, the Roman Catholic Church was discriminated against in the assignment of responsibilities. Especially did the Catholic Church object to the policy of exclusion. There was no freedom of conscience as far as the Indians were concerned. The Protestant churches were slow to object to this violation of one of the fundamental principles of the American constitution. The final revocation of some of the obnoxious provisions of the Peace Policy came in 1881 and is described in the last chapter of the book which bears the title, "A Victory for Religious Liberty." However, even though the Catholic Church worked under severe handicaps, yet, according to the author (p. 266): "The number of Catholic missionaries and teachers had more than doubled in the eight years of the Peace Policy." Much of this advance was due to the tireless efforts of General Charles Ewing, the first Catholic Commissioner for Indian Missions, and of his talented and devoted sister, Ellen Ewing Sherman, wife of General W. T. Sherman.

The present reviewer would point out that the delegation of "Flathead Indians" which visited St. Louis in the fall of 1831 (p. 55) were Nez Percés. The genealogical evidence from Nez Percé sources proves this. Also the so called joint letter of Marcus Whitman and A. B. Smith, (mentioned on page 55) could hardly be called a joint letter when Whitman did not sign it. The original letter is a part of the archives of the American Board on deposit in Harvard University. How-

ever, these are minor criticisms of a fine study in a new field. Would that some Protestant scholar would make as detailed a study of the effects of the Peace Policy on Protestant mission work as the author has here done for the Roman Catholics.

CLIFFORD M. DRURY  
*San Francisco Theological Seminary*  
*San Anselmo, California*

---

*The Strenuous Puritan: Hugh Peter, 1598-1660.* By RAYMOND PHINEAS STEARNS. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1954. 463 pages. \$7.50.

The subject of this study, Hugh Peter, had a colorful career. After a Cambridge education and ordination as a Puritan minister, Peter was in turn pastor of English Congregational exiles at Rotterdam, minister of Salem in New England and furious antagonist of Ann Hutchinson, diplomatic representative of Massachusetts Bay to the Long Parliament, Civil War chaplain and literary champion of the New Model Army, trusted agent and counsellor of Cromwell's government, and promoter of various utopian schemes for social reconstruction—all before his execution as a regicide at the Restoration. This is good material for a biography, and the author has produced a work which is characterized by thoroughness, a healthy scepticism with regard to the sources, and an abundant sympathy for a subject toward whom it is not always easy to be sympathetic.

The figure which emerges is that of a passionately partisan personality, a scholar trained under the influence of Hooker, Sibbes, and Ames for theological work but fascinated with politics, a preacher not without some interest in cure of souls but primarily effective as a rabble-rouser, a statesman with no real vision respecting a constitutional settlement but wonderfully capable as an organizer of specific practical tasks. And above all, there was a boundless energy in everything undertaken, whether it might be launching the Massachusetts fishing industry or raising a regiment for

Cromwell's Irish army. In all of these respects, Peter possessed characteristics held by many of his Puritan colleagues, but possessed them to such an extreme degree as to be almost a caricature of the political parson of the Civil War period.

This book is so competent (if somewhat overlengthy) a study, that it would be ungenerous to dwell on those aspects which somewhat unsatisfied the reviewer. One wonders, however, if more space might not have been devoted to Peter's personal theological history in an age when so many of his fellow-Puritans were experiencing religious uncertainty and change, and to his contributions to such specifically ecclesiastical politics as absorbed the energies of Stephen Marshall and Philip Nye. And most important of all, there is the central problem in the interpretation of Peter—the problem of the reconciliation of his New England and his English careers. To be sure, some continuity is provided by the fact that Peter was always a genuine revolutionary, and the author understands this. "The way we walk in is without precedent," Peter declared. "This is an Age to make examples and precedents in." This theme appears again and again in Peter's life: in his plans for a Massachusetts commonwealth, in his contempt for Lilburne's veneration of the common law, in his schemes for radical educational reorganization, and even in his plea for the destruction of Stonehenge. Like so many of his contemporaries, Peter was captivated throughout his life by the concept of a New Age, however his interpretation of this might change.

But is the problem of the change in Peter's outlook really solved? The author speaks of his embracing the cause of toleration as the adjustment of a practical mind to the altered political conditions of England. This may be true, but surely the intellectual pilgrimage of Hugh Peter was more fundamental than this implies. The inflexibly orthodox Congregationalist in hot pursuit of Massachusetts Antinomians was a genuinely different person from the man who could blame England's

miseries on "the disagreement of ten or 20 learned men," who consorted with mystics like Erbury, Dell, and Saltmarsh, and who could wish England rid of "Lords, Lawyers, and Levites." The analysis of this metamorphosis, if it were possible, would surely throw much light on the nature of Puritanism on both sides of the Atlantic.

J. F. MACLEAR

*University of Minnesota (Duluth)*

*Free Churches and Christian Unity.*  
By MARION JOHN BRADSHAW. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954. pp. xiv, 225. \$3.50.

There has always been an ambivalence among churchmen of the congregational or free church tradition toward church union. Although strong ecumenical leaders and significant mergers have come from these churches, a lingering doubt has always remained that "hard-won freedoms" might disappear in any approach toward union with churches of differing ecclesiologies.

Marion Bradshaw, professor of the philosophy of religion at Bangor Theological Seminary, is a Congregationalist who deeply distrusts the current ecumenical trend. This book is a plea for ecclesiastical pluralism and an expression of dissent from two movements currently engaged in by Congregationalists—the World Council of Churches and the proposed merger with the Evangelical and Reformed Church. The whole Ecumenical Movement is for him "A Drive Against Free Churches" in which unfortunately free church leadership is betraying its trust.

He sincerely believes that the World Council desires to be a "Super-Church" and that this goal is being promoted by unscrupulous men girded with a false theology. The basis of membership in the World Council—"Jesus Christ as God and Saviour"—is attacked, not only because it does "not express that central truth that Jesus is man as well as God," but by the more novel charge that this is a "new unitarianism," a pietistic modalism.

The biblical texts, the patristic references and the reasoning will be highly interesting to orthodox theologians. His own Christology is reminiscent of the kind of high Arianism current in some early nineteenth century Unitarian circles. He leans heavily upon the text, "The Father is greater than I," and prefers the Origenistic solution of a hierarchy of divine beings.

What is most interesting is the use of this charge of modalistic unitarianism as the basis for a further charge of soteriological and ecclesiastical monism. Such theology, he says, must lead "the unionizers" to "identify salvation with unity" and misconstrue "one flock" with "one fold." At this point the spectre of Romanism is evoked; consequently free churchmen should resist the ecumenical trend and fear it as the nose of the camel. Some will doubtless say that this will be the logical result, but most of Bradshaw's readers will regard his fears as exaggerated and his arguments as overstated. Nevertheless this book displays scholarship and the arguments should be carefully considered by those who wish to further the ecumenical movement.

VERNE D. MOREY

*Bridgton, Maine.*

*Religion Behind the Iron Curtain.*

By GEORGE N. SHUSTER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. \$4.00.

It is but natural that increasing Western interest in Eastern Europe and the problems of Soviet Communism has led, in recent years, to the appearance of a great many works dealing with various phases of life and politics behind the "Iron Curtain."

In view of the scarcity of materials in Western languages and the absence of a tradition of serious scholarship in the Eastern European field it is unfortunate, but perhaps inevitable, that the majority of publications have been in the popular or semi-popular vein. While Dr. Shuster's recent contribution to the study of religion behind the Iron Curtain reflects substantial progress in the standard of scholarship in

Eastern European studies it does not, however, aim at fulfilling the highest standards or desiderata.

*Religion Behind the Iron Curtain* is a general survey of religious developments during the last decade, written for the layman on the basis of newspaper reports, a variety of secondary accounts in Western languages, and the author's experiences while a high U. S. government official in Germany. The monograph is concerned primarily with the political aspects of religion, concentrating on the political position of the various churches of Eastern Europe (including Yugoslavia's), and the political attacks leveled against them by the Communist governments of the countries under Soviet domination. Dr. Shuster gives an accurate, if somewhat diffuse, account of the policy of subjugation of the Church by the State, invariably characterized by forcible transformation of all religious organizations into instruments for the support and endorsement of Communist policies. The author emphasizes the physical and judicial persecution of those religious leaders who, because of their allegiance to Rome or opposition to Communist ideology, have been unwilling to accept the supremacy of the Communist State over the Vatican or their own conscience. Institutional changes, notably the transformation of theological schools into state institutions and the appointment of laymen to key church positions, Communist policies toward the hierarchy, characterized by the virtual transformation of the clergy into civil servants, matters related to financial control, and general statistical information are some aspects of the problem which are, unfortunately, treated only in a cursory manner.

Perhaps more serious than the emphasis on political aspects of church problems is the author's tendency to place the problems of religion in Eastern Europe within the framework of a sketchy, and occasionally irrelevant account of political developments. His history of religion and religious organizations tends to become lost in the author's general, and somewhat superficial, historical treatment of the post

World War II period, and leaves the reader with the impression that Church and State were, and perhaps ought to be, vitally interconnected in a pre-, or post-Communist Eastern Europe. Without anticipating future developments, it is the reviewer's opinion that, before 1940 at least, the interconnection was not nearly as solid or vital as Dr. Shuster assumes.

Despite these shortcomings, unavoidable for lack of documentation in the original languages or familiarity with the specific problems of an area still largely *terra incognita*, Dr. Shuster has given a very readable, if somewhat journalistic, account of a subject of vital interest to all those concerned with Communism in general, and Eastern Europe in particular. A comprehensive and scholarly study on religion behind the Iron Curtain, however, remains to be written.

The book contains a brief but adequate index and a brief bibliography.

STEPHEN A. FISCHER-GALATI  
New York City.

---

*The Lord's Prayer; The Beatitudes.*  
By ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA, translated by Hilda C. Graef (Ancient Christian Writers, No. 18), Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland; Longmans Green, London, 1954. 210 pp. \$3.00.

The series of *Ancient Christian Writers* again offers us valuable patristic works previously unavailable in English. In this case the author has been curiously neglected by Western scholars until recently; but happily we are coming to appreciate Gregory of Nyssa as not only a learned and original Doctor of the Church, but also as an important devotional writer and mystic. The two series of brief sermons here translated expound his Platonic Christianity on the "plain and parochial" level—the mystic heights are there, but Gregory is also glad to explain "give us this day our daily bread" and "blessed are the merciful" as meaning exactly what they say. Light is of course thrown on various aspects of patristic thought, all the more usefully because inciden-

tally—the harmony which a Greek Father found between the Platonic quest and the evangelical call—the recognition of the fall and the belief in grace combined with a lack of interest in the technicalities of either which always puzzles Western theologians. Gregory's God draws us to our true home by the loveliness of his love, poor banished children of Eve though we are, and nothing more need be said. In form, Gregory's sermons with their clear expositions and vivid illustrations are good preaching for any age, and may be recommended to students of homiletics as well as of Christian thought.

Dr. Graef's translation is clear and attractive, and her notes helpful—though I think she finds an unnecessary problem in a passage of the sermon on the eighth Beatitude—"Paul receives the cross . . . Peter is crucified head downwards" (p. 172 and n. 114); the latter statement is a well-known legend, the former may be a slip, or a reference to passages such as Galatians 6:14. But let the preacher have the last word:

What is the prize, what the crown? It seems to me that what we hope is nothing else but the Lord Himself for He Himself is the Judge of those who fight, and the crown of those who win. He it is who distributes the inheritance; He Himself is the goodly inheritance. He is the portion and the giver of the portion; He makes rich and is Himself the riches. He shows you the treasure and is Himself your treasure. He draws you to desire the beautiful pearl. . . . For this He has promised, that those who have been persecuted for His sake shall be blessed, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven, by the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and power for ever and ever, Amen.

EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY  
Berkeley Divinity School.

---

*What Time the Tempest. An Army Chaplain's story.* By WALDO E. L. SMITH. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1953. \$4.00.

The vivid war experiences of a Canadian army chaplain from 1940 to 1945 are here narrated in an impressive way. It happens that the author holds an Edinburgh doctorate in

Church History, is professor of that subject in Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario, and has had a volume sponsored by the American Society of Church History. The book bears the marks of good historical writing, and Dr. Smith has lived through the events of which he writes. It makes lively reading throughout, and is especially thrilling in the treatment of the Dieppe assault and of the hazards and crises of the Italian campaign. To the latter, five chapters are given. Smith evidently loved the men he worked with, and he repeatedly reminds us of their simple courage and sustained morale amid the most nerve-shattering situations. He found them, we may say, basically, though not often vocally, religious. He pays fine tributes to many of his colleagues in the chaplaincy, some of whom gave their lives near his side. Between the lines we may realize something of the author's own valiant ministry to the men at the front, in which service under fire to the wounded and dying was the chaplain's daily work. (Smith's own devotion to his "lads" was recognized by the award of the Military Cross).

One cannot read this record without thinking that to the historians of Christianity in generations to come it will prove a source document of no slight value, exhibiting as it does the heroism and compassion, humor and faith that triumph over war's misery and waste.

JOHN T. MCNEILL

Middlebury, Vermont

*China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matthew Ricci: 1583-1610.* Translated from the Latin by LOUIS J. GALLAGHER, S. J. New York: Random House, 1953. v + 617 pages. \$7.50.

Matthew Ricci (1552-1610) was an Italian Jesuit who spent twenty-seven years in China. Besides being a consecrated missionary, Ricci was talented in mathematics and other sciences. We are indebted to Father Gallagher for presenting to us the first complete English translation of the journals of Ricci. Originally Ricci wrote the diary

in Italian, which was edited and translated into Latin by his colleague, Nicola Trigault. Trigault, in his preface, writes: "We are more interested in offering you the truth of facts than the pleasure of literary style." But the narrative of the China mission in the 16th and 17th centuries, seen through the keen eyes of Ricci, is interesting reading. Trigault's contribution to this book cannot be underestimated, because he made use of rich materials, such as the Annual Mission Letters and Ricci's documents to other missionaries, in addition to Ricci's own diary.

Ricci's work in China must be understood as a part of the historic missionary interest of the Society of Jesus. The Jesuits combined the zeal of the Counter Reformation, the spirit of medieval religious chivalry, and the influence of the Renaissance. The Society was officially established in 1540, and in 1541 Francis Xavier sailed from Europe to "save the Orient." His phenomenal success in Japan did not satisfy Xavier; he saw the strategic importance of converting China in order to "Christianize" the whole of Asia. Unfortunately, Xavier died in 1552 without setting foot in the Middle Kingdom.

Twenty-seven years after Xavier's death, his spiritual successor, Alexander Valignano, in his capacity as Jesuit visitor to the Indies, arrived at Macao which was a Portuguese settlement. This gifted missionary formulated a new missionary approach in a civilized land, stressing the need of mastering the language and familiarizing oneself with the culture and customs of the people. This was a departure from the hitherto accepted Jesuit policy of imposing European culture *in toto* on the natives. Valignano's new missionary policy was skillfully put into practice by Ricci.

Ricci was a child of his time. He accepted the Jesuit principle of first "reaching to the top and working down." Bribery, in the form of gifts, was utilized by Ricci to make the acquaintance of high officials. His mastery of the Chinese language and classic culture, plus his thorough train-



ing in Western science, opened many doors and won him the rank of a high Mandarin.

His journals are divided into five parts. Book One is a description of China in the 16th century—the general customs, social and political structure. Particularly interesting are the sections on “Religious Sects Among the Chinese” and “Signs of the Doctrines of the Saracens, the Jews, and of Christianity Among the Chinese.” Book Two is an historic account of the Jesuits’ attempt to enter China from the time of Francis Xavier. Book Three is the story of the new missionary work under the leadership of Valignano. Books Four and Five reveal what Ricci attempted to do and what he accomplished.

With the expansion of the missionary program, Ricci was appointed Superior of the Jesuit Mission in China “with full authority to conduct it as he judged to be for its greater good, and to open a new center where there was most hope of success.” Valignano strongly urged Ricci to open a residence in Peking because “there would never be any assurance of remaining permanently in China, unless someone should be favorably received by the king” (p. 296). Subsequent narratives reveal Ricci’s determination to reach Peking. After years of effort, and in spite of various seemingly insurmountable difficulties, Ricci finally set foot in the capital where he was permitted to remain as one of the literati. And, as Trigault states: “It was by means of a knowledge of European science . . . that Father Ricci amazed the entire philosophical world of China; proving the truth of its novelty by sound and logical reasoning” (p. 325). One of the important by-products of the work of the Jesuits was the discovery that “the Kingdom of China is one and identical with what some writers call the Great Cathay . . .” (p. 311).

Ricci’s belief in the *Logos Spermatikos* is well illustrated by his own statement: “Of all the pagan sects known to Europe, I know of no people who fell into fewer errors in the early ages of their antiquity than did the Chinese. From the very beginning

of their history . . . they recognized and worshipped one supreme being whom they called the King of Heaven” (p. 93). As such, he was inclined to idealize classical Confucianism. Understandably, Ricci made enemies among the Neo-Confucianists. Also, Ricci’s conviction that classical Confucianism was a *preparatio evangelica* and his policy of cultural adaptation were later refuted by his successor, Nicolo Longobardo, and other Catholic missionaries.

In the spring of 1610, at the height of his ambitious missionary undertaking, he became sick. On his sick-bed, he talked about his converts, about the church he was building, about the conversion of the Chinese people, and even about the conversion of the king. The end came peacefully to the gallant missionary-mandarin. Readers will long remember the words he spoke to his disciples: “I am leaving you on the threshold of an open door, that leads to a great reward, but only after labors endured and dangers encountered” (p. 563).

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA  
*Federated Theological Faculty*  
*University of Chicago*

*The Mercersburg Theology* by LUTHER J. BINKLEY. With an Introduction by John B. Noss. Franklin and Marshall College Studies, No. 7. Lancaster. 1953. 156 pp. No price given.

*Frederick Augustus Rauch, American Hegelian*, by HOWARD J. B. ZIEGLER. With A Foreword by Lee M. Erdman. Franklin and Marshall College Studies, No. 8. Lancaster. 1953. 103 pp. No price given.

These two monographs are doctoral dissertations, the one from Harvard, the second from Columbia University. The former makes no “contribution to knowledge” in terms either of historical materials or of interpretation. It does not succeed in defining what the Mercersburg theology was, and its extraordinary jejune estimate of the movement is merely that it assisted the German Reformed church in coming to terms with modern science and Biblical

criticism. The study lacks the first essentials of historical method. There is almost no regard to the chronology of the literature. The author has apparently never investigated the training or intellectual history of the chief theologian of the group up to the age of forty. And he is very uncertain as to which of the works written thereafter are more important and why. The theological opposition is not defined. The points at issue are uncertain; matters of common consent are elaborated painfully while crucial theses are barely mentioned if at all. There is no serious attempt to define the divergencies among the chief representatives of the movement. Statements from various men at various periods are thrown together on no particular principle under the heads of Christology, the doctrine of the Church, sin and salvation, and liturgy. The student who wants a coherent and intelligent account of what this was all about must turn instead to George Richard's *History of the Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church*. He may profit, however, from Mr. Binkley's bibliography, although it has notable omissions. As for the repeated assurances of Mr. Binkley and Mr. Noss that the ideas of Mercersburg are "dead," anyone who is at all conversant with "Faith and Order" discussions in the ecumenical movement must be wholly unconvinced.

Mr. Ziegler's dissertation is much less ambitious in scope, but on the other hand is more competently executed and fruitful in results. Mr. Ziegler's researches into Hessian university archives, first of all, will require a radical revision of Rauch's biography. The older opinions as repeated, e.g., by Binkley (pg. 126, although he cites Ziegler!) report that Rauch served "as professor extraordinary at Giessen" and "was appointed to a full professorship at Heidelberg" but had to flee Germany because of his "political liberalism." Ziegler demonstrates that Rauch never held any professorship, and was habilitated as a *privat dozent* only after considerable intrigue and extra-academic pressure in which his character did not always appear whol-

ly honorable. There is no evidence that he was a political refugee, but much to indicate that he had ruined his academic prospects in Germany and accumulated more debts than he could readily meet.

Rauch's advanced studies and doctoral dissertation were in the field of classical philology, but after receiving his degree in 1827 he developed an enthusiasm for philosophy and Hegel in particular, which was to shape the rest of his literary production and teaching. Mr. Ziegler has investigated Rauch's relations with Daub and concludes that it was probably Daub who turned Rauch's attention to Hegel in 1827/28. He has compared Rauch's *Psychology* (1840) with Hegel's *Philosophie des Geistes* and shows its conformity to and dependence upon the latter. The *Psychology* was thus in effect the presentation in English of Hegel's *Philosophy of Spirit*. Hegelian influence is also traced in Rauch's shorter and earlier pieces.

Mr. Ziegler's final problem then arises. How did Rauch put together the convictions of an evangelical Christian and absolute idealism? Mr. Ziegler approaches this problem through the debate between Murdock and Gerhart as to whether Hegelian idealism is compatible with Christian faith and theology. His conclusion seems to be that Murdock's case, on the whole, is the better. "This interpretation of the Christ serves to destroy, rather than resolve, the paradox of Christianity." (81) The relation of Rauch's thought, and Hegelianism in general, to the "Mercersburg theology" of Nevin and Schaff is another subject which lies beyond the scope of Mr. Ziegler's investigation.

J. H. NICHOLS

University of Chicago

---

*Primer on Roman Catholicism for Protestants* by STANLEY I. STUBER. New York. Association Press. 276 pages. \$2.50.

The aims of this book are admirably stated by the author in his Preface: "(1) to explain in as factual, objective,

and simple a way as possible the basic beliefs and practices of the Roman Catholic Church; (2) to let the reader view these beliefs and practices as Roman Catholics themselves view them; (3) to present the author's interpretation of the general Protestant point of view in relation to each of these beliefs and practices; (4) to provide basic information that can encourage intelligent co-operation and equally intelligent but unemotional disagreement within a spirit of Christian love and understanding." (p. vii.) By wise selection from authoritative Roman Catholic sources and equally discerning choice of interpreters of Protestantism, Mr. Stuber has realized his aims in a volume that should serve equally well as hand-book on Roman Catholicism and concise summary of Protestant positions. It should be pointed out, however, that Catholics of non-Roman persuasion will not find their beliefs adequately treated nor will they always find themselves in agreement with the objections stated to the beliefs and practices of Roman Catholics. An important instance of this tendency to define the Protestant position somewhat narrowly is to be found on page 105 where, in bold-face type, the following statement is made: "Protestantism repudiates Roman Catholic dogma, definitions, and tradition because it believes that each individual has the divine right to believe as led by the Spirit of Truth." It is my guess that a majority of non-Roman Christians would not find their dogmatic position correctly stated in these words.

There are chapters of particular value on Absolute Authority and Power of the Pope (Chapter 4), Place of the Laity in the Roman Catholic Church (Chapter 8), What Roman Catholics Believe About the Bible (Chapter 10), Marriage, Divorce, the Family and Birth Control (Chapter 12), Education and the Public School (Chapter 19). A Chapter on The Vatican and its World Power provides the most helpful brief summary of Vatican organization and world-wide Roman Catholic Church membership which I have seen. The author has provided for

each chapter a helpful list of Protestant reference books and has concluded his work with an interesting and well-stated summary of the chief differences between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. (p. 262 ff.) He warns against using these statements out of their context or as an attack on the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and one is moved to express gratitude to a writer in this field of current tension who is mindful of his responsibility to present material which is not only correct but complete.

RALPH DOUGLAS HYSLOP

*Pacific School of Religion*

*Lyman Abbott: Christian Evolutionist.* By IRA V. BROWN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953. Pp. 303. \$5.00.

Lyman Abbott—preacher, publicist, and politician—was one of the more conspicuous figures of the American religious scene during the decades immediately preceding and following the end of the nineteenth century. Editor of *The Outlook* and successor to Henry Ward Beecher as pastor of Brooklyn's Plymouth Church, Abbott has been described as an "almost complete incarnation" of the "romantic liberalism" which increasingly dominated American religious life as the nineteenth century moved toward its close.

Professor Brown has recounted the story of Abbott's long career with fidelity to fact and minimum of interpretation. The picture which emerges is of a man who "possessed an extraordinary ability to see which way the wind was blowing" and "seldom attempted to beat against it." The inconstancy and inconsistency in which Abbott was continually involved sprang from the basic presupposition of his "evolutionary theology." Anchoring his faith firmly to the conviction that the "Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed" could not be wrong, Abbott was frequently compelled to welcome as good that which he had only shortly before denounced as evil. P. S. Hen-

son became so exasperated by Abbott's shifts of front that he described him as "the most extraordinary instance of retrogressive evolution I have ever known." Abbott had turned himself inside out and was still turning. "When the last turn is complete I doubt if anything will be found inside."

One of Abbott's most glaring about-faces took place at the time of the Spanish-American War. Having been a critic of the rising tide of chauvinism, he almost overnight became an apologist for what now seemed to him to be America's imperial destiny. After listening to one of Abbott's "outbursts of spread-eagleism" in 1902, a British visitor charged him with being "a sort of cultivated W. R. Hearst."

Brown clearly demonstrates that Abbott cannot be regarded in any

sense as a pioneer. His role was to "popularize" the new religious thinking so congenial to his time. Even in terms of the application of the notion of evolution to religion, he was a Johnny-come-lately, following the path previously blazed by John Fiske, Joseph Le Conte, Henry Drummond, and Henry Ward Beecher. Abbott's diminishing interest in the specifically religious was reflected in the change of the name of his periodical from *The Christian Union* to *The Outlook* and in the progressive elimination of the specifically religious departments in it. Before its final demise, *The Outlook* was taken over by Alfred E. Smith as a personal political organ following his failure to obtain the Democratic nomination for the presidency in 1932.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

9







